

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1894.

DESCRIPTIVE ANIMAL NAMES IN GREECE.

COMMENTATORS on Hesiod have noted certain quaint, picturesque phrases, occurring chiefly in the *Works and Days*, as evidence of a so-called 'oracular or religious style.'¹ Götting, for example, remarks:² 'magnam Hesiodi carmina familiaritatem produnt cum Pythiorum sacerdotum oraculis eorumque toto loquendi modo,' and as instances of this Delphian dialect cites the following words: *φερέοικος* (*W. and D.* 571), *ἀνόστεος* (524), *πέντοζος* (742), *αὔον* and *χλωρόν* (743), *ἴδρις* (778), *ἡμερόκοιτος ἀνὴρ* (605), *χειροδίκης* (189), *μῦθοι σκολιοί* (194) and *δίκαι σκολιαί* (221), *εὐφρόνη* (560), *νῆος πετρά* (628), *γλαυκή* (*Th.* 440). The list is not exhaustive — Van Lennep *e.g.* adds *κεραοὶ καὶ νήκεροι ὑληκοῖται* (*W. and D.* 529) — but it will serve to indicate the phraseology in question.

That these and similar forms of speech really emanated from Delphi seems to me to be a proposition that has been accepted too readily. The Pythian priestess was indeed wont to use a jargon of obscure and unobvious words, which gave her responses a grandiloquent air not without a seasoning of ambiguity. Plutarch says³ that Apollo ultimately forbade her to call her fellow-citizens *Πυρῖκαοι*, the Spartans *Ὀφιοβόροι*, mankind in general *Ὀρέανες*, rivers *Ὀρέμποται*, and so forth — *ἀφελὼν τῶν χρησμῶν ἔπη καὶ γλώσσας καὶ περιφράσεις καὶ ἀσάφειαν*. But the recondite wording of Delphian oracles was only a particular example of

that enigmatic and symbolic language which was the common possession of all Greek mystics,⁴ and does not on examination bear more than a superficial resemblance to the descriptive style of Hesiod. Nor is there, so far as I am aware, any ancient authority for connecting the two. To take Götting's list: in no single case do the scholia allude to Delphi, while more than once they definitely assign other localities as the provenance of the phrases in dispute. But if, in view of their testimony, we are unable to regard Hesiod's peculiar terminology as due to Delphian influence, if we cannot go so far as to call it the 'dialectus deorum,' it remains to ask from what source *were* derived those striking expressions which give pause to all who are familiar with the even flow of epic verse. In the present inquiry I propose to limit myself to the animal names, perhaps the most salient of the said expressions; and I shall attempt to show that Hesiod has availed himself of a few graphic provincialisms, which with a poet's instinct he has incorporated in his otherwise conventional vocabulary.

It will probably be admitted that in Greece, as in our own country, descriptive animal names were either (a) universally recognized, (b) restricted to local usage, or (c) poetic neologisms. Just as *wag-tail* or *glow-worm* with us are *κύρια ὀνόματα*, while *hod-man-dod* (a snail) would be barely intelligible to a Londoner though expressive

¹ Mahaffy, *Greek Classical Literature*, i. 124, n. 2.

² *El.* 1843, p. xxix.

³ *De Pyth.* or. 24.

NO. LXXIII. VOL. VIII.

⁴ Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* V. viii. 45–50) affords ample proof of it in the case of Orphic and Pythagorean writers.

enough in Suffolk; so with the Greeks *κύλλουρος* or *πυγόλαμπος* would pass current anywhere, while *φερέοικος*, which Dionysius Thrax understood of the snail and others of the tortoise,⁵ meant an insect of some sort to the Arcadians.⁶ Again, just as Browning⁷ alone is responsible for *sea-fruit* in the sense of anemones or *long-ears* as a synonym for ass, so an Aeschylus or a Sophocles⁸ may *jure suo* term the eagle *Διὸς πτηνὸς κύων*.

But it is with provincial variants that we are more immediately concerned. Further examples are collected by Lobeck;⁹ some few of them may be names of distinct species, but the majority are alternative appellations of a local sort. With the help of Hesychius we may enumerate the following. *Ἀργίπους*¹⁰ was a Macedonian word for an eagle. The Athamanes called *fishes* *ἀσπάλως*,¹¹ a word possibly connected with *ἀσπαίρω*. *Grasshoppers* in Elis were *βάβακοι*, that is 'chatterers'; though in Pontus the same term denoted *frogs*.¹² The Laconians called the *sow* the 'clod-digger,' *βωλόρυχα*.¹³ At Syracuse the *worm* was known as *γαφάγας*.¹⁴ *Swans* at Elis were *δειρήται*.¹⁵ *Kids* fed on straw were called *διακαλαμάσφακες*¹⁶ in a Rhodian law. The *ass*, from wagging its ears, was *κύλλος*¹⁷ among the Dorians; from its stubbornness was *μέμνων*¹⁸ at Athens—the stallion-ass being *μυχλός*¹⁹ among the Phocians. The Thebans said *κοπιλάδας* for *snail*, and *δραλίχον* for a *cock*.²⁰ *Λιγάνταρ* was a Laconian name for the *grasshopper*,²¹ *λακέτας*²² and *ἀχέτας*²³ being Doric equivalents for the same creature. *οπιπτοῖδα* was the Boeotian word for a *cuttle-fish*.²⁴ *ταχίνας* meant a *hare*²⁵ to the Lacedaemonians, a *stag*²⁶ elsewhere. *ἵραξ*, connected by L. and S. with a Sanskrit root meaning to 'cry,' was Aetolian for a *mouse*.²⁷ In Mace-

donia the *lion* was known as 'bright-eyes,' *χάρων*,²⁸ a word also used to denote an eagle.²⁹

It will be seen that many of these provincial terms are strictly analogous to the animal names of Hesiod. Consequently, I should prefer to regard *ἀνόςτειος*, *φερέοικος*, *ἴδρις*, as local names for *cuttle-fish*, *snail*, and *ant*, rather than as terms adopted from the vocabulary of the Delphian oracle. Of course the Delphians, like other Greek communities, had idioms of their own. For instance, when Pindar³⁰ uses *καρταίποδα* to denote a *bull*, the scholiast *ad loc.* observes that it was a word peculiar to the inhabitants of Delphi—*οὕτως Δελφοὶ ἰδίως τὸν ταῦρον*. And it is likely enough that the priestess of Apollo would employ such words for Loxian purposes: thus *ἡδύπνον*, an epithet of similar formation, was according to Polemon used by the Pythian to mean a *young lamb*.³¹ But to infer that Hesiod's phraseology is necessarily 'oracular or religious' seems to me quite an erroneous limitation.

It would, however, be rash to argue that, because a descriptive animal name was not universally recognized, therefore it must be a provincialism. This would be to leave out of account our third division—poetic innovations—of which examples are not far to seek. Archilochus³² calls an eagle *μελάμπυγος*, a word with a double reference, but apparently modelled on *πύγαργος*, which is used by Sophocles³³ and others to denote a further variety of the same bird.³⁴ Aeschylus writes *ἀνθεμονργός* for *bee*,³⁵ *λάμπουρις* for *fox*,³⁶ and perhaps *μελάγκερος* for *bull*.³⁷ Later poets furnish numerous instances; e.g. Theocritus uses *μηκάδες*³⁸ for *goats*; Lycophron *ἐλλοψ*³⁹ for a *fish*; Nicander *βρωμήτης*⁴⁰ or *βρωμήτωρ*,⁴¹ the *Anthology* *ὄγκητης*,⁴² for an *ass*. Hence it is evident that, in default of express witness to their origin, it is unsafe to conclude that such words were not mere freaks of the poet's fancy. As regards Hesiod, we have it on

⁵ *Elym. Mag.* 790, 35 s.v. *φερέοικος*.

⁶ Proclus on Hesiod, *W. & D.* 571.

⁷ *The Englishman in Italy: A Pillar at Sebzevar*.

⁸ Aesch. *P. V.* 1022, *Ag.* 136; Soph. *fr.* 766.

⁹ *Aglaophantus*, p. 847 ff.

¹⁰ Hesych. s.v.

¹¹ Idem, s.v.

¹² Idem, s.v.

¹³ Idem, s.v.

¹⁴ *Elym. Mag.* 221, 49; *Anecd. Bekk.* i. 230.

¹⁵ Nicander *ap.* Athen. 392A.

¹⁶ Hesych. s.v.

¹⁷ Pollux, vii. 56.

¹⁸ Idem, ix. 48.

¹⁹ Hesych. s.v.

²⁰ Strattis *ap.* Athen. 622A.

²¹ Hesych. s.v.

²² Ael. *N. A.* 10, 44.

²³ Arist. *Av.* 1095, *Pax* 1159.

²⁴ Photius, p. 249; Strattis *ap.* Athen. 622A.

²⁵ Ael. *N. A.* 7, 47.

²⁶ Hesych. s.v. *ταχίνης*.

²⁷ Schol. on Nic. *Alex.* 37.

²⁸ Schol. on Lyc. 455.

²⁹ Lyc. 260.

³⁰ *Ol.* xiii. 81.

³¹ Hesych. s.v.

³² *Frag.* 110, Bgk.

³³ *Frag.* 931.

³⁴ *Elym. Mag.* 695, 50.

³⁵ *Pers.* 604.

³⁶ *Frag.* 397; ep. Theoc. viii. 65, ὦ λάμπουρε κύων, and v. 112, τὰς δασυκέρκους ἀλάπεκας.

³⁷ Schol. on *Ag.* 1118.

³⁸ Theoc. i. 87, v. 100.

³⁹ Lyc. 598, 796.

⁴⁰ *Ap.* Athen. 683E.

⁴¹ *Theoc.* 357.

⁴² *Anth.* P. ix. 301, 1.

the authority of Kleitarchos that *ἀνόρρεος* was a Lacedemonian word for *cuttle-fish*,⁴³ and Dionysius Thrax is cited for the fact that *φερέουκος* was the name of an Arcadian insect:⁴⁴ *ἴδις* is unvouched for, but, if analogy goes for anything, should be set down as a third example of provincialism.

It is tempting to pursue the topic further, and to raise the question, Are these descriptive names of animals to be attributed merely to the inborn poetry of rustic wits, or do they possess any deeper significance? In the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xiv. 157, I ventured to suggest that nomenclature of this type is comparable with that of some totem clans, which 'are careful not to speak of their totem by its proper name, but use descriptive epithets instead.'⁴⁵ Mr. Frazer apprises me that indirect modes of address are found also where there is no question of totemism, and he has most kindly furnished me with the following cases in point. Natives in Bechuanaland count it unlucky to speak of 'a lion by his name, Tao: he is called *the boy with the beard*.'⁴⁶ Monteiro states that the blacks of Angola 'always use the word Ngana or "Sir" when speaking of the lion, as they believe that he is fetish, and would not fail to punish them for their want of respect if they omitted to do so.'⁴⁷ Certeux and Carnoy relate that the Arabs call the lion 'Monseigneur Johan-ben-el-Johan,' that is, John son of John.⁴⁸ Suma-

trans call the tiger by coaxing and euphemistic terms,⁴⁹ such as 'ancestor' or 'the free wild beast' or 'the old man.'⁵⁰ The same islanders call crocodiles by the honourable title of 'grandfather.'⁵¹ Sayyids and high-class Musalmans affirm that when you see a snake you should call it not by its proper name, but either *sher* (tiger) or *rassi* (string).⁵² According to Mateer natives of Travancore 'are careful not to speak disrespectfully of such powerful creatures (as serpents): as the Malayalies of the Shervaray Hills, while hunting the tiger, only speak of it as a dog, so the cobra is called *nalla tambiran*, "the good lord," or *nalla pambu*, "the good snake,"'⁵³ Bourke states that among the Apaches 'only ill-bred Americans or Euro-

answered, Samuel—but I bear the *kunya* Abū 'Amr (father of 'Amr), although no 'Amr exists.'

A *kunya* may also be given to inanimate objects, e.g. a battle-field is called *Ummu kastal*, 'mother of dust,' the Red Sea is called *Abū Khālid*, 'father of Khālid' (Khālid being a common name), etc.

The following *kunyas* are applied to animals—

1. Abū Ayyūb (father of Job) = the camel.
2. Abū-l-ḥusain (father of the little fortress) = the fox.
3. Abū-l-Ḥārith = the lion.
4. Abū Ja'da = the wolf.
5. Abū Jukhādib = a kind of locust.
6. Abū barākish (father of spots) = a kind of wild bird.
7. Ummu 'Amir (mother of 'Amir) = the hyaena.

In some of these cases the selection of the name has an obvious reason, but in others it is altogether obscure. Names like Al-Ḥārith and 'Amir were extremely common among the Arabs, and it is therefore by no means certain that in calling the lion 'father of Al-Ḥārith' and the hyaena 'mother of 'Amir' the Arabs were guided by the etymological meaning of the name, for in proportion to the commonness of a name its original sense ceases to be thought of.

The poet Ash-Shanfarā, of the sixth century of our era, predicting that he will be slain in battle, says to his unfriendly fellow-tribesmen:—

'Do not bury me, for that is a thing forbidden to you, but receive the glad tidings, O mother of 'Amir!—i.e. he prefers to be devoured by the hyaena rather than to be buried by his tribe. The scholiast on this verse tells us that 'it is the custom in hunting the hyaena to dig out her hole, she meanwhile retreating little by little, and the hunter saying, "Mother of 'Amir, she is not here, receive the glad tidings, Mother of 'Amir, concerning lean sheep and locusts clinging together!" So the hunter continues to dig, repeating these words, and the hyaena retreats until she reaches the bottom of her hole, when she rushes out with fury' (see the *Ḥamāsa* of Abū Tammām, ed. Freytag, p. 242 of the Arabic text, p. 431 of the 1st vol. of the Latin translation).

⁴⁹ Marsden, *Hist. of Sumatra*, p. 292.

⁵⁰ Bastian, *Die Völker des östlichen Asien*, v. p. 51.

⁵¹ Nieuwenhuisen en Rosenberg, *Het eiland Nias*, p. 115.

⁵² Panjab Notes and Queries, i. no. 122.

⁵³ Native Life in Travancore, p. 320 f.

⁴³ Proclus on Hesiod *W. & D.* 524.

⁴⁴ Idem *ibid.* 571.

⁴⁵ Frazer, *Totemism*, pp. 15–16.

⁴⁶ *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xvi. 84.

⁴⁷ Angola and the River Congo, ii. 116.

⁴⁸ *L'Algérie Traditionnelle*, i. 172. Prof. A. A. Bevan supplies me with the following note on Arabian appellations.

The *kunya* is the name which Arabian parents derive from one of their children (usually the eldest son), as when a man is called *Abū Mālik* (father of Mālik), a woman *Ummu Mālik* (mother of Mālik), etc.

Among the Arabs it is considered more polite to address a man by his *kunya* than by his real name ('ism') or his nickname ('lakab'). In the early days of Islam there were people who maintained that only persons of Arabian descent had a right to be called by a *kunya*, that the *Mawālī* ('Clients,' i.e. foreigners converted to Islam) did not deserve such an honour. It is worth noticing that the same man might bear several *kunyas*, and, in particular, warriors sometimes bore one *kunya* in battle and another in time of peace (see Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, Halle 1889–1890, Erster Theil, p. 267). Sometimes a man's *kunya* was derived not from a real but from a fictitious son; thus for example the poet Abū Nuwās (who died early in the ninth century after Christ) says in describing a conversation with a Jewish tavern-keeper—

'We said to him, What is your name? and he

peans, who have never had any "raising," would think of speaking of the bear, the snake, the lightning, or the mule, without employing the reverential prefix "Ostin," meaning "old man," and equivalent to the Roman title Senator.⁵⁴ Leemius⁵⁵ says of the Lapps of Finmark: 'ursum proprio et genuino suo nomine *Gnouzha* compellare non facile audebant, metuentes, ne, si fecerint, immanis belua solito crudelius armenta dilaniaret; vero itaque suppresso nomine, *Moellda-Aigja*, senem cum mastruca, appellare solebant.' Similarly Miss Stokes⁵⁶ says: 'The Laplander speaks of the bear as "the old man with the fur coat": in Annam the tiger is called "grandfather" or "lord." The Finnish hunters called the bear "the apple of the forest," "the beautiful honey-claw," "the pride of the thicket." Among the Wotjaks the bear is termed the "uncle of the wood."⁵⁷ The Estonians call the bear 'broad-foot,' the wolf 'grey-coat,' thinking that if thus addressed they will be inclined to clemency.⁵⁸ Gubernatis states that a girl in an Estonian tale accosts a crow, whose help she needs, as 'bird of light.'⁵⁹ Swedish traditions enumerate certain creatures that are not to be mentioned by their own but by euphemistic names for fear of incurring their wrath.⁶⁰ Even in the Shetlands, fishermen, when at sea, will not mention the salmon directly, nor yet certain other objects such as the pig, the cat, the minister, but use some circumlocution to escape the ill-omened words.⁶¹

In the foregoing examples of this widespread practice the country folk avoid the risk of offending the animal by using some periphrasis of a deferential sort in lieu of the actual name. This periphrasis may take the form of a descriptive title—'the boy with the beard,' 'broad-foot,' or 'grey-coat.' And it is, I think, possible that similar animal names in vogue among the Greeks are to be accounted for by some such underlying superstition. At any rate the parallelism is sufficiently striking; and the euphemistic evasion of the direct name is quite in the Greek spirit. To the stock instances should be added *Μακρόβιοι*, which, Hesychius informs us, was the Rhodian

name for the nymphs. Rennell Rodd in his volume on *The Customs and Lore of Modern Greece* remarks (p. 188) that the vampire in Crete and Rhodes is known as *Καταχανὰς* the Destroyer, in Tenos as *Ἀνακαθούμενος* the Snatcher, in Cyprus as *Σαρκομένος* the Flesh-eater: similarly (p. 202) the devil is 'not to be named save indirectly, or under some euphemistic title such as *ὁ πλανήτης* the Wanderer, *ὁ ἀμελέτητος* the Unmentionable, *ὁ μαῖρος* the Black one, *ὁ καλὸς ἄνθρωπος* the Good man, or even—as in Rhodes and elsewhere—*ὁ ἐξ ἀπὸ 'δῶ*, which may be interpreted, the Get-thee-behind-me.' An extreme case is the modern Greek for the small-pox (*ibid.* p. 135), viz. *Εὐλογία*, 'she that must be named with respect.'

But if we cannot affirm that the animal names used by the Greek peasantry are to be considered the outcome of primitive superstition, there is at least one case (hitherto, I believe, overlooked) in which a descriptive title seems to be associated with an animal cult—I refer to the name *Μελάμπους*, *Black-foot*. The similarity of this word to many of the formations already noticed will be at once perceived. *Μέλας* is an obvious element in the compound, occurring also in *μελαγκόρνος*, the *black-cap*; *μελάμπυγος*, the *eagle*; *μελαναίετος*, the *black eagle*; *μελάνδερος*, the *redstart*; *μελάνουρος*, the *black-tail* (fish or snake), &c. And as examples of animals named from some peculiarity attaching to their feet we have *δασύπους*, *εἰλίποδες*, *ἐλλόποδες*, *ἐρυθρόπους*, *πολύπους*, for generic terms; *Πόδαργος*, the horse, *Ποδάργη*, the equine harpy, and the *Ἴππος Βροτόπους* of the Nikaiaans,⁶² for particular specimens.⁶³ On Greek moneys, too, the foot sometimes stands for the entire creature. The device of *Kranion* in *Kephallenia* was a ram; for this some coins substitute a ram's head, the foreparts of a ram, or a ram's foot.⁶⁴ Again, the currency of *Psophis*, which usually bears a stag or the foreparts of a stag, in one case shows on the reverse a stag's hoof.⁶⁵ But, granted that the word *μελάμπους*, so far as its mere formation goes, may be ranked with the Estonian 'broad-foot' or the Greek *ἀργίπους*, *ἐρυθρόπους*, as an animal name, is there any proof that the mythical *Μελάμπους*, the seer

⁵⁴ *On the Border with Crook*, p. 132.

⁵⁵ *De Lapponibus Commentatio*, p. 502.

⁵⁶ *Indian Fairy Tales*, p. 260.

⁵⁷ Max Buch, *Die Wotjaken*, p. 139.

⁵⁸ Büeler-Kreutzwald, *Der Elsten abergläubische Gebräuche*.

⁵⁹ *Zoological Mythology*, i. 151.

⁶⁰ Thorpe, *Northern Mythology*, ii. 83.

⁶¹ A. Edmonston, *Zetland Islands*, ii. 74.

⁶² Mionnet, *Médailles Antiques*, Suppl. vol. v. Pl. I. p. 148.

⁶³ Cp. Jean Ingelow's, 'Come up *White-foot*, Come up *Light-foot*.'

⁶⁴ Brit. Mus. *Cat. of Gr. Coins*; *Peloponnesus*, Pl. XVI. 16, 24, 25: pp. 78, 80.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* Pl. XXXVI. 20; p. 198, where the design is described with a ?

of the *Odyssey*, stood in close relation to an animal that might be so described?

In the first place we recall the legend that Melampus was acquainted with the language of animals.⁶⁶ Then, he cured the daughters of King Proetus of their animal mania. And he possessed the power of transforming himself into various shapes.⁶⁷ These fables suffice to connect him with the animal world in general, but more exact references are not wanting. The fact that he was worshipped as patron deity at Αἰγόσθηνα suggests that the animal with which he was especially associated was the *goat*. The suggestion is supported by an imperial coin of Aegosthena, which represents an infant suckled by a goat.⁶⁸ On this Prof. Percy Gardner comments: ⁶⁹ 'I am not aware that there is any record of the existence of a tradition that Melampus was suckled by a she-goat; but nothing is more likely. Such stories were told of highly-gifted men, and it is fairly certain that the type of the coin must refer to a noted native of Aegosthena, and so to Melampus, who was its only remarkable man.' Further support is given by Pliny, xxv. 47 (ed. Sillig), who writes: 'Melampodis fama divinationis artibus nota est; ab hoc appellatur unum hellebori genus Melampodion. Aliqui pastorem eodem nomine invenisse tradunt capras purgari pasto illo animadvertentem datoque lacte sanasse Proe-

tidas furentis, quam ob rem de omnibus eius generibus dici simul convenit.' Mr. R. Carr Bosanquet, who first showed me the passage, observes that this 'shepherd of the same name' must be identical with the mythical Melampus, inasmuch as Pliny attributes to the former the cure of the Proetides which is commonly credited to the latter. Here, then, we have evidence on the one hand that Melampus was suckled by a goat, on the other that he was a goat-herd. When we reflect that he bears a name closely resembling those given by the Greek peasantry to animals, and peculiarly appropriate to a goat, may we not infer that in primitive times he was himself conceived as a sacred goat? Other facts tally with this inference. Melampus was said to have introduced to the Greeks the cult of Dionysus. Now the attendants of that deity—Pans, Satyrs, and Sileni—are regularly represented as partially caprine in form, and are sometimes called αἴγες, Pan especially being αἰγυπόδης or τραγόπους.⁷⁰ Moreover, Melampus' fame rested largely on his talent for curing madness, and Dionysus was invoked ἐπὶ παύσει τῆς μανίας under the title of Μελάναιγος.⁷¹

If this explanation of Μελάμπος be admitted, it lends some colour to the view that the descriptive animal names of the Greek provincials owe their origin to some such primitive superstition as has been shown to obtain elsewhere.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

⁶⁶ Apollod. I. ix. 11—12.

⁶⁷ *Mythogr. Gr.* ed. Westermann, p. 384, 9.

⁶⁸ Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 329.

⁶⁹ *J.H.S.* vi. 58, with Quarto Plate L, A.

⁷⁰ Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, i. 326-8; ii. 34-7.

⁷¹ Suidas s.v.

CRITICAL NOTES ON CLEM. AL. STROM. III.

Book III.

§ 2, p. 510. (A quotation from Isidorus).
ὅταν δὲ ἡ εὐχαριστία σου εἰς αἴτησιν ὑποπέσῃ καὶ στήσ τὸ λοιπὸν οὐ κατορθώσῃ ἀλλὰ μὴ σφαλῇ, γάμῃσον. For στήσ read ὑποστήσ, the ὑποδ having been lost owing to the preceding ὑποπέσῃ. The corruption is as early as Epiphanius, by whom the passage is cited. Just below it is said of one who wishes to strengthen himself in his resolution not to marry οἷτος τοῦ ἀδελοῦ μὴ χωρίζεσθω, λεγέτω ὅτι Εἰσελήλυθα ἐγὼ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, οὐδὲν δύναμαι παθεῖν. The plural τῶν ἀδελφῶν seems more appropriate.

§ 4, p. 511. οὐ διδάσκει δ' αὖ τὴν σωφρονεῖν. Read αὐτῇ. 'This principle (ἐγκράτεια) not only inculcates, but creates, temperance.'

Ib. ἡμεῖς εἰνονχίαν μὲν—μακαρίζομεν, μονογαμίαν δὲ...θαναμάζομεν, συμπάσχειν δὲ δέιν λέγοντες καὶ ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζειν. Omit δὲ before δέιν.

§ 6, p. 512. ἐπεὶ μὴ διακρίνει πλούσιον ἢ πένητα ἢ δῆμον ἄρχοντα, ἄφρονάς τε καὶ τοὺς φρονούντας, θηλείας ἄρσεας. For ἡ δῆμον ἄρχοντα read δῆμον ἢ ἄρχοντα 'common people or ruler.'

Ib. ἡλιος κοινὸς τροφὰς ζωῆς ἅπασιν ἀνατέλλει δικαιοσύνης τε τῆς κοινῆς ἅπασιν ἐπ' ἰσῆς δοθείσης. Omit τε before τῆς. [I. B. suggests γε.] In the last line of the § Potter's reading δικαιοσύνη is confirmed by the phrase κοινωνίαν ὑπὸ δικαιοσύνης which follows in the next §.

§ 7, p. 513. τὸ τ' ἐμὸν καὶ τὸ σὸν φησι διὰ

τῶν νόμων παρεισελθεῖν μηκέτι εἰς κοινότητα, κοινά τε γὰρ καρπουμένων μήτε γῆν μήτε κτήματα. Omit κοινά τε γὰρ as a dittography of εἰς κοινότητα, which should be taken with καρπουμένων.

§ 8, p. 513. (A quotation from Epiphanes). 'Men abandoned the community of women established by the Creator, καὶ φησιν, Εἰ μίαν ἀγόμενος ἐχέτω δυναμένων κοινωνεῖν ἀπάντων.' Sylburg's emendation of ὁ for εἰ is generally accepted: read also εἶχετο for ἐχέτω. It is a statement of fact, not of law. Perhaps εἰ may have originated in a marginal correction of the first syllable of ἐχέτω.

Ib. πῶς ἔτι οὗτος ἐν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐξετασθείη λόγῳ; Insert ἂν after πῶς, 'how could such an one be reckoned as belonging to our doctrine?'

§ 9, p. 514. (Another quotation from Epiphanes). ἔνθεν ὡς γελοῖον εἰρηκότος τοῦ νομοθέτου ῥήμα τοῦτο ἀκουστέον 'οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις' πρὸς τὸ γελοϊότερον εἰπεῖν 'τῶν τοῦ πλησίων.' Transfer ἀκουστέον, placing it before εἰπεῖν, 'after the Lawgiver had uttered the ridiculous word "Thou shalt not desire," we must hear him say still more absurdly "what belongs to thy neighbour."' Perhaps we should read in the preceding line ἐν αὐτοῦ (for αὐτῷ) τῷ πολυθρυλῆτῳ βιβλίῳ.

Ib. τὸ δὲ 'τῆς τοῦ πλησίων γυναῖκος' ιδιότητα τὴν κοινωνίαν ἀναγκάζων ἔτι γελοϊότερον εἶπεν. Insert εἰς after γυναῖκος with Potter.

§ 12, p. 515. The followers of Marcion object to marriage, fighting against the Creator καὶ σπεύδοντες πρὸς τὸν κεκληκότεν ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν ὡς φασὶ θεὸν ἐν ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ, ὅθεν οὐδὲν ἴδιον καταλιπεῖν ἐνταῦθα βουλόμενοι κ.τ.λ. Read οὗτος, ὡς φασὶ, θεὸς ἐν ἄλλῳ τόπῳ. The Good—thus Marcion distinguished the Supreme God from the Demiurge whom he characterized as Just—who has called his own elect out of the world, does not reign as God here, but in another world, for which reason they do not care to leave anything of their own behind them in this world.

§ 13, p. 516. The philosophers from whom Marcion got his idea τὴν γένεσιν κακὴν εἶναι do not hold this to be naturally evil, ἀλλὰ τῇ ψυχῇ τῇ τὸ ἀληθὲς διαδοῦσθ'· κατὰ γούσι γὰρ ἐνταῦθα τὴν ψυχὴν θείαν οὖσαν καθάπερ εἰς κολάστηριον τὸν κόσμον. Read τῇ <μῇ> τὸ ἀληθὲς διδούσθ', this life is not in itself evil, but only evil to the soul which failed to see the truth. Or perhaps we might read τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν τὸ ἀληθὲς <μῇ> διδοῦσαν: it is not γένεσις but the erring soul which is evil. Compare for the phrase

ἀλήθειαν διδεῖν *Strom.* p. 335 *fin.* The allusion is to Plato *Phaedr.* 248 'After the divinities, which contemplate absolute truth, come the other souls for whom the law is laid down that ἥτις ἂν ψυχὴ θεῶ ξυνοπαδὸς γενομένη κατὰ δὴ τι τῶν ἀληθῶν... ἀβλαβῆ εἶναι' ὅταν δὲ ἀδυνατήσασα ἐπισπείσθαι μὴ ἴδῃ, λήθης τε καὶ κακίας πλησθεῖσα βαρυνθῇ, it loses its wings and falls to the earth and receives a body of man or some animal': also p. 249 οὐ γὰρ ἦ γε μὴ ποτε ἰδοῦσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν εἰς τόδε ἤξει τὸ σχῆμα (*i.e.* human form).

[§ 16, p. 518. διότι τοῦτο σημαίνει ἂν ἡ σημαίῃ ἢ ψυχῇ, καὶ ταύτῃ σῆμα ὀρθῶς καλεῖσθαι. For τοῦτο read τοῦτω. I. B.]

§ 21, p. 520. οὐκ καὶ Ἡράκλειτος θάνατον τὴν γένεσιν καλεῖ; Πυθαγόρας δὲ καὶ τῷ ἐν Γοργίᾳ Σωκράτει ἐμπερὶς ἐν οἷς φησὶ 'θάνατός ἐστιν ὁκῶσα ἐγερθέντες ὀρέμεν.' Read with Stephanus and Bywater (*Heracl.* p. 25n.) Πυθαγόρα τε.

§ 25, p. 522. τῶν δὲ ἀφ' αἰρέσεως ἀγομὲν ἐν Μαρκίωνος μὲν τοῦ Ποντικῷ ἐπεμνήσθημεν. Read ἀναγομῆνον, as in § 5 οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Καρποκράτους... ἀναγομῆνοι.

Ib. κὰν συγχρήσωνται τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνῇ λέγοντος τῷ Φιλίππῳ 'ἄφες—μοι.' ἀλλ' ἐκείνο σκοπεῖτωσαν ὡς τὴν ὁμοίαν τῆς σαρκὸς πλάσιν καὶ Φίλιππος φέρι... πῶς οὖν σάρκιον ἔχων νεκρὸν οὐκ εἶχεν; ὅτι ἐξανέστη τοῦ μνήματος τοῦ Κυρίου τὰ πάθη νεκρώσαντος, ζήσαντος δὲ Χριστῷ. The first sentence is wrongly joined to the preceding sentence by Dindorf: it is the protasis of which the apodosis begins in ἀλλ' ἐκείνο. Put a comma therefore after μοι. For ζήσαντος, written mechanically after νεκρώσαντος, read ἔζησε. Potter's emendation ζωοποιήσαντος is negatived by the fact that we must understand τοῦ Κυρίου of Christ.

§ 26, p. 523. ἀποβολὴ πάθους ἦν εἰς μέσον τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τῆς ζηλουτεπονημένης ἐκκλήσεως γυναῖκος. Transfer ἦ before εἰς μέσον, as in Eusebius.

§ 27, p. 523. (On the use of the word κοινωνία). ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ κοινωνία, ἀγαθὸν δὲ καὶ ἐν μεταδόσει ἀργυρίου καὶ τροφῆς καὶ στολῆς, οἱ δὲ καὶ τὴν ὁμοίαν δίψου' οὖν ἀφροδισίων συμπλοκὴν κοινωνίαν ἀσεβῶς κεκληκασιν. The phrase δὲ καὶ occurs three times in these lines. I cannot but think that on the second occasion it has slipped in from the line above in place of μὲν, which would be easily lost before ἐν.

Ib. φασὶ γοῦν τινὰ αὐτῶν ἡμετέρᾳ παρθένῳ ὡραία τὴν ὄψιν προσελθόντα φάναι. Read τῶν ἡμετέρων for ἡμετέρα and insert τινὶ before τῇ. Both τῶν and τινὶ would be easily lost after αὐτῶν and before τὴν, and

ἡμετέρων would be naturally changed to agree with παρθένω.

Ib. p. 524. (διαφενδονται) οἱ παραχαράσσοντες τὴν ἀλήθειαν, μᾶλλον δὲ κατασκάπτοντες ὡς οἷόν τε αὐτοῖς, οἱ γὰρ τρισάθλιοι τὴν τε σαρκικὴν καὶ τὴν συνουσιαστικὴν κοινωνίαν ἱεροφαντοῦσι. For οἱ γὰρ τρισάθλιοι read οἱ τρισάθλιοι, οἱ γὰρ, 'unhappy ones who make a sacred rite of mere fleshly union,' and omit τε and τὴν.

§ 29, p. 525. εἰ γὰρ καὶ οἱ τοῖ...πνευματικῶς ἐτίθεντο κοινωνίας, ἴσως τις αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόληψιν ἐπεδέξατο. Read ἐπεδέξατ' ἄν.

§ 30, p. 525. The followers of Prodicus claim to be free because they follow their pleasures, κρατηθῆναι ὑπ' οὐδενός... βασιλεῖ δὲ φασι νόμος ἀγραφός. πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι οὐ ποιοῦσιν ἃ βούλονται πάντα. It is evident, as Potter has observed, that the latter sentence is inconsistent with the former, and that some such words as ταῦτα δὲ ψευδῇ λέγουσιν must have been lost. [I. B. suggests οὖν for ὅτι.] At the end of the § 'πᾶς γὰρ' φησὶν 'ὁ ἁμαρτάνων δοῦλός ἐστιν' [ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει], omit the words in brackets. [H. J. reminds me that Sylburg in his Index s.v. φησί gives other examples of the pleonastic use of φησί. In the few relevant cases I think the explanatory clause should be regarded as a gloss.]

§ 31, p. 525. ἱβρίζει δὲ τις ξένος πολίτας καὶ τοῦτους ἀδικεῖ, οὐχὶ δὲ ὡς παρεπλήμης τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις χρώμενος ἀπρόσκοπος τοῖς πολίταις διαβίῳ; For ἀπρόσκοπος read ἀπρόσκοπτος.

§ 32, p. 525. ὁ γοῦν ἐκκεντήσας τὸν πόρον ἐν λαβούμενος πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δείκνυται. Read with Lowth εἰλογοῦμενος.

§ 35, p. 527. ἡ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐστὶ κακὸν καὶ οὐκέτι μέμψως ἄξιος ὃν αἰτιάσθε ὡς ἀντιτεταγμένον τῷ θεῷ, οὐδὲ κακοῦ τινος γέγονε ποιητικός—συναναίρεται γὰρ τῷ κακῷ καὶ τὸ δένδρον—ἡ εἰ ἐστὶ τὸ πονηρὸν ἐν ὑπάρξει κ.τ.λ. The reference is to the Demiurge, the author of the Mosaic law, spoken of in the previous §§. We learn from Tertullian that Marcion used the figure of the tree and its fruit to prove that he was of an evil nature, cf. *adv. Marc.* ii. 23 Marcion defendit arborem bonam malos quoque fructus non licere producere, and i. 2. Insert τῷ καρπῷ before τῷ κακῷ, comparing § 44 ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν καρπῶν τὸ δένδρον, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ πετάλων γνωρίζεται. Clement's argument is that either there is no evil fruit, and then (since there is no other sign of an evil tree, but its evil fruit) we have no ground to believe in an author of evil; or if there is evil, it is that which is forbidden by the law which you ascribe to the Demiurge, who is therefore opposed to evil.

§ 36, p. 527. οὐδὲ γῆν πλωτὴν, βατὴν δὲ θάλασσαν ἐργάζεσθε; καθάπερ οἱ τὰς ἱστορίας συνταξάμενοι τὸν βάρβαρον ἐβέλησαι Ξέρξην. Add φασὶν or ἱστοροῦσιν.

§ 38, p. 528. γεγράφθαι γὰρ φησὶν 'ἀνέστησαν θεῷ καὶ ἐσώθησαν.' οἱ δὲ καὶ τῷ ἀναιδεῖ θεῷ προστιθέασιν. Can ἀναιδής mean 'ruthless,' or should we read ἀνελεεῖ here and below? We are told that Marcion regarded the God of the O.T. as *severus et saevus* (Tert. *ib.* ii. 11), but he is nowhere characterized as *impudens*. It was easy for ΑΝΑΙΔΕΗΣ to pass into ΑΝΑΙΔΗΣ, and the confusion once made was likely to be repeated. Perhaps we should read τὸ for τῷ both here and below in τῷ μὲν οὖν ἀναιδεῖ θεῷ οὐ γέγραπται.

§ 42, p. 530. ἐπιμελητέον τε τῆς ψυχῆς, ἢ πρὸς μόνῳ τῷ θεῷ διατελεστέον. The following sentence καθαρὸς γὰρ ὢν καὶ πάσης κακίας ἀπῆλλαγμένος ὁ νοῦς δεκτικός πως ὑπάρχει τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως inclines me to read ἢ μόνῳ πρὸς τῷ θεῷ.

§ 43, p. 530. θεοῦ δὲ γινώσκιν λαβεῖν τοῖς ἐν ὑπὸ τῶν παθῶν ἀγομίοις ἀδύνατον οὐκ οὖν οὐδὲ τῆς ἐλπίδος τυχεῖν μηδεμίαν τοῦ θεοῦ γινώσκιν πεποιημένους καὶ τοῦ μὲν ἀποτυγχάνοντος τοῦδε τοῦ τέλους ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄγνοια κατ' ἡγορεῖν ἔοικε, τὸ δὲ ἀγνοεῖν τὸν θεὸν ἢ τοῦ βίου πολιτεία παρίστησιν. παντάπασιν γὰρ ἀδύνατον ἅμα τε καὶ ἐπιστήμονα εἶναι καὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος κολάκειαν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεσθαι οὐδὲ γὰρ συναδεῖν ποτὲ δύναται τὸ ἀγαθὸν τῇ ἡδονῇ ἢ μόνον εἶναι τὸ καλὸν ἀγαθῷ ἢ καὶ μόνον καλὸν τὸν Κύριον καὶ μόνον ἀγαθὸν τὸν Θεόν. For κατηγορεῖν read κατηγορεῖσθαι 'ignorance of God seems to be predicated of him who fails to attain the Christian hope.' [I. B. suggests κατηγορία and περιπεποιημένους.] In the last clause read τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἢ ἡδονῇ for τὸ ἀγαθὸν τῇ ἡδονῇ, and ἀγαθὸν for ἀγαθῷ. 'Pleasure cannot agree with truth either that the beautiful alone is good, or that the Lord alone is beautiful and God alone good.' It would be easy for ἀληθείᾳ ἢ to drop out between τῇ and ἡδονῇ, and τὸ ἀγαθὸν would as easily slip in from the line below. The context shows that the opposing parties are truth (or knowledge) on the one hand and pleasure on the other.

§ 44, p. 531. καὶ φῶς ἐκεῖνο...τὸ πάντα κατὰδῃλα ποιοῦν τὰ τε ἐν γενέσει αὐτὸν τε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐαυτὸν τε γινώσκειν παρασκευάζον καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ βόλον καθίστασθαι δίδασκον. Omit the first τε, which would only be admissible if it were taken with the following τε to couple the τὰ ἐν γενέσει and τὸν ἄνθρωπον under the government of ποιοῦν, whereas τὸν ἄνθρωπον comes under the government of παρασκευάζον. [I. B. would read γὰρ for τε.]

Ib. ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐλευθερίαν μεμαθήκαμεν ἢν ὁ Κύριος ἡμᾶς ἐλευθεροῖ μόνος, ἀπολύων τῶν ἡδονῶν τε καὶ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων παθῶν ὁ λέγων ἔγνωκα τὸν Κύριον καὶ τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ μὴ τηρῶν ψεύστης ἐστίν... Ἰωάννης λέγει. Put a full stop after παθῶν and insert δέ before λέγων.

§ 47, p. 533. ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, φησὶν, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται. This text is adduced by the Encratites as an argument on their side. I think therefore Sylburg is right in suggesting φασὶν for φησὶν.

§ 48, p. 533. πῶς οὖν οὐ πεινώσι καὶ διψῶσι καὶ τὴν σάρκα πάσχουσιν; Should we not read τὰ σαρκικά? The latter word would easily be changed to σάρκα, and the gender of the article would be made to suit. [Insert κατὰ after καί. I. B.]

§ 50 and § 51, p. 534. ὁ τε Κυρηναῖος Ἀριστοτέλης Λαῖδα ἐρῶσαν ὑπερεώρα μόνος. ὁμωμοκῶς οὖν τῇ ἐταίρῃ ἢ μὴν ἀπάξειν αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα... γραψάμενος αὐτῆς ὡς ὅτι μάλιστα ὁμοιοτάτην εἰκόνα, ἀνέστησεν εἰς Κυρήνην. For οὖν I think we should read γοῦν.

§ 53, p. 536. τίς αὐτῶν μνηστὴρ καὶ ζῶντην δερματίνην ἔχων περιέρχεται ὡς Ἡλίας; ἢ περίζωμα... οἱ μακάριοι προφήται. This sentence contains a comparison between the Encratites and the saints of old, who thankfully used God's creatures, and yet surpassed the Encratites in mortification of the flesh. It has no connexion with what immediately precedes, but fits in perfectly in § 52 after οἱ δὲ καὶ τούτους ὑπερφέρειν λέγοντες πολιτεία καὶ βίῳ, οὐδὲ συγκριθῆναι ταῖς ἐκείνων πράξεσι δυνήσονται, to which place it should be transferred.

§ 55, p. 536. πενία δὲ ἄνδρα ταπεινοῖ, χεῖρες δὲ ἀνδρῶν πλουτίζουν. Read, as in the original (Prov. x. 4), ἀνδρείων.

§ 56, p. 537. ὁ μὲν γὰρ στείρων καὶ πλείονα συνάγων οὗτός ἐστιν... ἕτερος δὲ ὁ μηδενὶ μεταδίδους κενῶς καὶ θησαυρίζων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Read κενῶς δέ.

§ 57, p. 537. τὸ εἶναι φῶς (ἄμεινον) τοῦ περὶ φωτός λαλεῖν καὶ ἡ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐγκράτεια τῆς ὑπὸ τῶν φιλοσόφων διδασκομένης. οὐ γὰρ ὅπου φῶς, ἐκεῖ σκότος, ἐνθα δὲ ἐστὶν ἐπιθυμία ἐγκαθεζομένη μόνῃ τυγχάνουσα, κἂν τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ ἡσυχάζῃ τῇ διὰ τοῦ σώματος, τῇ μνήμῃ συνομιλεῖ πρὸς τὸ μὴ παρόν. Put a colon after σκότος, and for οὐ γὰρ read οὐ γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐκεῖ οὐδεμία ἐπιθυμία ἐνεστίν· οὐ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. The line from οὐ γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα to οὐ γὰρ would be easily lost. Perhaps for μόνῃ we should read μνήμης.

§ 59, p. 538. πάντα, φησὶν, ὑπομείνας ἐγκρατὴς ἦν, θεότητα Ἰησοῦς εἰργάζετο.

Put a comma after ὑπομείνας and read πάντα ἐγκρατὴς ὦν.

§ 60, p. 538. Βραχμᾶναι γοῦν οὔτε ἐμψυχον ἐσθίουσιν οὔτε οἶνον πίνουσιν, [ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ὡς ἡμεῖς] τὴν τροφήν προσίενται, ἐνιοὶ δ' αὐτῶν διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν. Omit the words in brackets as a marginal note, and transfer τὴν τροφήν προσίενται to the end.

§ 62, p. 539. φανερωθῆναι δέι ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, [ἵνα κομίσῃται ἕκαστος διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε κακόν] ἵνα ἂ διὰ τοῦ σώματος ἔπραξεν τις ἀπολάβῃ. Omit the clause in brackets as a marginal note quoting 2 Cor. v. 10.

Ib. ἰδοὺ γέγονε καινὰ, ἀγνεία ἐκ πορνείας καὶ ἐγκράτεια ἐξ ἀκρασίας, δικαιοσύνη ἐξ ἀδικίας. Omit καί.

§ 65, p. 540. ἡ προκατάρξασα τῆς παραβάσεως 'ζωὴ' προσηγορεύη διὰ τὴν τῆς διαδοχῆς αἰτίαν τῶν τε γεννωμένων τῶν τε ἀμαρτανόντων γίνεται, ὁμοίως δικαίων ὡς καὶ ἀδίκων μῆτρ. For ἀμαρτανόντων read ἀποθησκοίντων, insert ὅ' after γίνεται, and put the comma before, instead of after γίνεται. 'Eve was named "life" as she is the cause of succession both of those who are born and of those who die, and becomes the mother alike of the just and the unjust.' [Perhaps all that is wanted is a colon after αἰτίαν. The word ἀμαρτανόντων carries on the idea of προκατάρξασα τῆς παραβάσεως. I. B.]

§ 67, p. 541. Let no one think marriage sinful [εἰ μὴ πικρὰν ὑπολαμβάνει παιδοτροφίαν—πολλοῖς γὰρ ἐμπάλιν ἄτεκνία λυπηρότατον—] μηδ' ἂν πικρὰ ἢ παιδοποιία φαίνηται τινι μεταπερισπῶσα τῶν θείων διὰ τὰς χρεώδεις ἀσχολίας· μὴ φέρων δ' οὗτος εὐκόλως τὸν μονήρη βίον ἐπιθυμεῖ τοῦ γάμου... συνορῶ δ' ὅπως τῇ προφάσει τοῦ γάμου οἱ μὲν ἀπεσχημένοι τούτου... εἰς μισανθρωπίαν ὑπερρύθσαν. With the existing reading it is difficult to make out the relation of the two hypothetical clauses: there is no clear reference for οὗτος, and the last γάμου makes nonsense. Transfer the words in brackets after ἀσχολίας, read ὁ τοιοῦτος for οὗτος and ἀγασμοῦ for the last γάμου, translating '(Let none think marriage sinful) not even if the begetting of children seem to some to be a root of bitterness, as distracting them from divine things owing to the troubles it entails; unless, that is, he thinks the rearing of children itself undesirable. Many on the contrary think childlessness a most miserable condition. And such an one, not being able to endure the solitary life, desires marriage—and I notice that those who have abstained from it under the pretext of holiness have become a prey to misanthropy.'

§ 68, p. 542. The last sentence in this section seems to me a gloss. It contains a cursory mention of two interpretations of Matt. xviii. 20, interposed between the interpretations which Clement himself thinks worthy of discussion. At the beginning of § 69 τάχα δὲ καὶ τὴν κλήσιν τὴν τε ἐκλογὴν δευτέραν καὶ τρίτον τὸ εἰς τὴν πρώτην τιμὴν κατατασσόμενον γένος αἰνίσσεται ἡ προειρημένη τριάς, I think πρώτην should be inserted before the first or second τὴν.

§ 70, p. 543. τρίτος δὲ ἦν ἐκ τῶν δυνεῖν κτιζόμενος εἰς εἰς καινὸν ἄνθρωπον. Both Dindorf and Klotz omit the necessary εἰς, which is given in Potter's text without any suggestion of its being conjecturally added.

§ 72, p. 543. ὅθεν οὐ δεῖξίαις ἐγκύμονι πλησιάζαντα τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τινά. For δεῖξίαις, which may have been accommodated to the following εὐρύς αἶν, read δεῖξεις.

§ 74, p. 544. ταύτας οὖν ἔχετε τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, φησὶν, ἀγαπητοί, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτῶν τὰς καρδίας. Restore ἔχοντες from 2 Cor. vii. 1. Even Clement could not have used the second person with καθαρίσωμεν staring him in the face.

§ 77, p. 545. ἐπιβοᾷ, 'τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν δι' ἁμαρτιῶν, δηλῶν ὡς ὅτι μὴ νεὺς, τάφος δ' ἐστὶν ἔτι τῆς ψυχῆς. Perhaps we should read μὴ ὅτι for ὅτι μὴ, interpreting 'not only is the body not a temple, it is still the tomb of the soul.' Another remedy might be to suppose ὡς to be a marginal correction, altering δηλῶν into δηλ<ὡς>ων. We find μὴ used with ὅτι in the quotation from Isidore p. 488 ἐάν τι πείσμα ὧς ὅτι μὴ ἔστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μονομερὴς, and very frequently with ἐπεὶ. Schmidt (*Atticismus*) gives many instances from Dio Chrysostom, Lucian and others.

Ib. ὁπνίκα (τὸ σῶμα) ἀγιασθῇ τῷ θεῷ 'τὸ πνεῦμα' ἐπείσσει 'τοῦ ἐγείραντος ἐκ νεκρῶν' Ἰησοῦν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. There seems no reason for the future here. Perhaps ἐπιφέρει may have been corrupted through the ζωοποιήσσει in the following line: or if a faint φ were mistaken for ο, it would be easy for ἐπιφέρει to pass into ἐποισει, cf. p. 650, where Klotz reads ἐποισει with the Paris MS. against ἐπιδέγει of the ordinary text.

§ 78, p. 546. ἵνα γινώσκωμεν...τὸν τῷ ὄντι πατέρα, τὸν τῶν ὄντων μόνον πατέρα τὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν παιδεύοντα ὡς πατέρα καὶ τὸν φόβον ἀπειλεῖ. The sentence is evidently incomplete: ἀπειλεῖ perhaps represents some such words as ἀπειλὴς ἔνεκα μόνους τοῖς μὴ πειθόμενοις εἰσάγοντα.

§ 79, p. 546. εἰ δὲ ὑπερβῆς ὃν εἴλετο κανόνα εἰς μείζονα δόξαν, ἔπειτα ἀποπέσῃ πρὸς τὴν

ἐλπίδα. Dindorf makes a lacuna at the end. Perhaps ἐλπίδα represents ἐλάττωμα, ὅμως μὴ ἀποβαλέτω τὴν ἐλπίδα, 'If he transgresses the rule (of celibacy), which he chose for his greater glory, and falls away afterwards to the inferior rule (of marriage), still let him not cast away his hope.' The resemblance between ἐλάττωμα and ἐλπίδα would explain the loss of the intervening words. Should we read ἐὰν for εἰ before the subjunctive?

§ 81, p. 548. ὁρᾷς εἰς τίνα βλασφημοῦσιν οἱ μωσαττόμενοι τὴν σόφρονα σποράν καὶ τῷ διαβόλῳ προσάπτεσθαι γένεσιν; Potter changes προσάπτεσθαι into προσαπτόμενοι. I should rather add τολμῶντες after γένεσιν.

§ 82, p. 548. Speaking of the Apostolic injunction in 1 Cor. vii. 5 'μὴ ἀποστρέφειτε ἀλλήλους εἰ μὴ τι ἂν ἐκ συμφώνου πρὸς καιρὸν,' Clement says οὐ γὰρ ἀποκρούεται τέλειον τὰς τῆς φύσεως ὁρέξεις διωσωπούσα ἡ πρόσκαιρος συμφωνία, δι' ἣν εἰσάγει πάλιν τὴν συζυγίαν τοῦ γάμου. Read δι' ἧς, the συμφωνία being simply the means by which he provides for the renewal of conjugal intercourse.

Ib. οὐ πολυγαμίαν ἔτι συγχωρεῖ (ὁ Κύριος): τότε γὰρ ἀπῆλθε ὁ Θεός, ὅτε αὐξάνεσθαι καὶ πληθύνειν ἔχρην. It cannot be said that God ever required polygamy. It would be nearer the truth to read ἀπῆλθε, 'God yielded to the demand'; but ἐφέτω seems to me to suit the context best. [I. B. suggests παρῆναι.]

Ib. (If the Apostle allows second marriage in certain cases) δόξαν δὲ αὐτῷ οὐρανίαν περιποιεῖ μέινας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν διαλυθεῖσαν θανάτῳ συζυγίαν ἀχραντον φυλάσσων. Read αὐτῷ and insert ὁ before μέινας 'still he who abides by himself lays up for himself glory in heaven.'

Ib. οὐ γὰρ ἐπάναγκες παιδοποιίας ἀφίστησι τοὺς πιστεύοντας δι' ἐνὸς βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸ παντελὲς τῆς ὁμιλίας ἀπολούσας ὁ Κύριος, εἰ καὶ τὰ πολλὰ Μωσέως δι' ἐνὸς περιλαβὼν βαπτίσματος. Put commas after πιστεύοντας and ἀπολούσας, and read ὁ for εἰ, as above in § 8.

§ 84, p. 549. After quoting from Rom. vii. 4 'εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ἡμᾶς ἑτέρῳ τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι,' Clement continues ἐξακούεται γὰρ πρὸς ἐχθρῶς 'ὑπηκόους γενομένους'—at least this is Potter's reading without any hint that it is changed from the MS.; Dindorf however follows Klotz in giving προσεχέας, which I do not understand, and attributes προσεχῶς to Heinsius.

§ 86, p. 550. 'ἦν ἡ γῆ τοῦ Ἰακώβ ἐπαγινόμενη παρὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν' φησὶν ὁ προφήτης τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δοξάζων. κατατρέχει δὲ τις γενέσεως...καὶ βιάζεται τις ἐπὶ

τεκνοποιίας λέγων εἰρηκέναι τὸν σωτήρα κ.τ.λ. The MS. here has αὐτός, but Dindorf reads αὐτοῦ with the original in Barnabas, where the editors explain it of the body of Christ. Here the reference is to the body of the Christian, regarded as the vessel of the Spirit, and I think αὐτό is the true reading. The body itself (which the Enekratites scorn) is glorified. For the first *τις* read *τῆς*.

Ib. τάχα δ' ἂν καὶ οἷς διελέγετο ὡς ἁμαρτωλοῖς προφητεῖε φθοράν. Should not τάχ' ἂν be followed by the optative?

§ 87, p. 551. ἐπεὶ μὴ ἄνευ γενέσεώς τις τόνδε τὸν βίον παρελεύσεται. Insert *εἰς* after *τις*.

Ib. εἰς μὲν οὖν ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Probably we should read ἡμῶν, as in the original (Matt. xxiii. 9), since the second person is continued in the latter part of the quotation just below (μὴ καλέσητε οὖν ἡμῖν).

§ 89, p. 552. ὁ προφήτης φησὶ...κατεμιάθης ἐν γῇ ἁλλοτρίᾳ τὴν τε κοινωνίαν μιᾶν ἡγομένους. Omit *τε*. [Or read *γε*. I. B.]

§ 90, p. 552. ὁ σωτήρ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, γενεὴν εἰπὼν πονηρὰν καὶ μοιχαλίδα, διδάσκει μὴ ἐγνωκότας νόμον...παράδοσις δὲ τῇ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἐντάλμασιν ἀνθρώπων κατηκολουθηκότας. μοιχεύειν τὸν νόμον, οὐχ ὡς ἄνδρα καὶ κύριον τῆς παρθενίας αὐτῶν δεδομένον, τάχα δὲ καὶ ἐπιθυμίας δεδουλωμένους ἀλλοκότοις, οἷδεν αὐτούς. Remove the full stop before μοιχεύειν and the comma after ἀλλοκότοις, and put a comma after μοιχεύειν and a full stop after δεδομένον. Also insert *δεχομένους* before δεδομένον, translating 'The Saviour, when he called the Jews a wicked and adulterous generation, shows that they committed adultery in not having known the law, but having followed the traditions of men, not receiving the law as given to be the husband and lord of their virginity. Perhaps too he perceives them to be enslaved to strange lusts.'

§ 93, p. 553. ὅταν οὖν...ψυχὴν ἐνώσει. Read ἐνώση.

§ 95, p. 554. ὅταν οὖν ὁ ἀπόστολος εἶπη 'ἐνδύσασθε τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον'...ἡμῖν λέγει...παλαιὸν δὲ οὐ πρὸς γένεσιν καὶ ἀναγέννησιν φησιν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν βίον τὸν τε ἐν παρακοῇ τὸν τε ἐν ὑπακοῇ. It seems necessary to insert καὶ καινὸν after παλαιὸν δέ.

Ib. οἱ γαμοῦντες ὡς μὴ γαμοῦντες, οἱ κτώμενοι ὡς μὴ κτώμενοι, οἱ παιδοποιούμενοι ὡς θνητοὺς γεννῶντες [ὡς καταλείφοντες τὰ κτήματα, ὡς καὶ ἄνευ γυναικὸς βιωσόμενοι ἂν δέη,] οὐ προσπαθῶς τῇ κτήσει χρώμενοι, μετ' εὐχαριστίας δ' ἀπάσης καὶ μεγαλοφρονοῦντες. It is evident that the clauses here follow no natural order. I am disposed to think that the words in brackets were marginal notes on

ὡς μὴ γαμοῦντες and ὡς μὴ κτώμενοι. For κτήσει read κτίσει with Potter, and insert μὴ before μεγαλοφρονοῦντες.

§ 96, p. 554. The words of the Apostle καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι, διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω...ἵνα μὴ πειράξῃ ὑμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς, were uttered for the sake of those who were inclined to indulge themselves too freely ὡς μὴ πολλὴ ἐπινεύσας ὁ δι' ἐναντίας ἐκκυμῆν τὴν ὀρεξὶν εἰς ἁλλοτρίας ἡδονάς. τάχα δέ, ἐπεὶ τοῖς δικαίως βιοῦσιν ἀντίσται διὰ ζήλον...ὑπάγεσθαι τούτους τῷ ἑαυτοῦ τάγματι βουλόμενος, ἀφορμὰς δι' ἐγκρατείας ἐπιπόνου παρέχειν τοῖς βούλειται. In the last sentence the subject is evidently Satan. The preceding clause, as it stands, suits neither Satan nor the Apostle, nor can it be understood of the self-indulgent man spoken of before. In place of an emendation of my own, which I had proposed to Prof. Bywater, I gladly accept his correction of ἐπινεύσας for ἐπινεύσας, 'in order that the adversary may not blow strongly upon them and stimulate (lit. 'lash into waves') the appetite for forbidden pleasures.' Cf. *Paed.* ii. p. 179 οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐγκυμαίνονται ἐπὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων αἱ ὀρέξεις περὶ τὰ τῆς μέθης νανάγια.

§ 98, p. 555. οὐ γὰρ μόνον ἡ εἰνούχια δικαιοὶ οὐδὲ μὴν τὸ τοῦ εἰνούχου σάββατον, ἂν μὴ ποιῇ τὰς ἐντολάς. For μόνον read μόνη.

Ib. Referring to Isa. lxxv. οὐ τεκνοποιήσουσιν εἰς κατάραν, C. says, ἄλλοι δὲ κατάραν τὴν παιδοποιᾶν ἐκδέχονται καὶ οὐ συνιάσι κατ' αὐτῶν ἐκ ἐίνων λέγουσαν τὴν γραφήν. For ἐκείνων read ἐκεῖνο.

§ 101, p. 557. εἰ δὲ καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστρέφων ἐξ ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τὴν πίστιν ἀπὸ τῆς συνηθείας τῆς ἁμαρτωλοῦ οἶον μητρός ἐπὶ τὴν ζωὴν ἐπιστρέφει, μαρτυρήσει μοι εἰς. For εἰ read ὅτι.

Ib. p. 558. ἡ δὲ τινες καὶ τῆς παρθένου τὴν χήραν εἰς ἐγκράτειαν προτείνουσι καταμεγαλοφρονησασαν ἢς πεπείραται ἡδονῆς. For the unmeaning προτείνουσι read προτιμῶσι.

§ 102, p. 559. κἂν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων τὴν ἐπιτήδευσιν τῆς συμβουλίας ὁ ὀφίς εἰληφώς καὶ παρατείσας τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς Εἵας συγκαταθέσθαι τὸν Ἀδὰμ λέγει, ὡς ἂν μὴ φύσει ταύτῃ κεχρημένων τῶν πρωτοπλάστων...ἡ κτίσις πάλιν βλασφημεῖται. For συμβουλίας read συνουσίας, and λέγεται for λέγει.

§ 103, p. 559. πῶς δ' ἄνευ τοῦ σώματος ἡ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καθ' ἡμᾶς οἰκονομία τέλος ἐλάμβανεν; ὅπου γε καὶ αὐτὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν σαρκὶ μὲν ἀειδὴς διεκλήλυθεν καὶ ἄμορφος, εἰς τὸ ἀειδὲς καὶ ἄσώματον τῆς θείας αἰτίας ἀποβλέπειν ἡμᾶς διδάσκων. Insert ἂν before ἄνευ. Dindorf has followed

Sylburg in reading *ἀειδής* for MS. *ἀηδής*, but the ordinary meaning of *ἀειδής* is 'invisible,' and the fact that it is used in this sense immediately below makes it impossible to understand it here of one 'who has no form or comeliness.' On the other hand such a one would be naturally regarded as *ἀηδής*, and if there is something offensive in the expression as used of Christ, this is explained by reading *δὴ ἐλγλυθεν* for the unmeaning *διελγλυθεν*, since *δὴ* has the effect of putting the preceding word in inverted commas. [Perhaps *δὴ ἐλγλυθεν*. C. plays on the word *ἀειδής*, which he first uses in the sense of 'ugly' (not uncommon in late Greek), and then in its philosophic sense of 'invisible.' I. B.]

§ 105, p. 560. οἱ δὲ ἀφηγιάσαντες ἐξέβρισαν... αὐτοὶ τε ἀκατασχέτως ἐχόμενοι καὶ τοὺς πλησίον ἀναπέθοντες φιληδονεῖν. Should not we read *ἐχόντες* for *ἐχόμενοι*? [I. B. suggests *ἐπόμενοι*.]

§ 106, p. 560. After the quotation *πολεμισταὶ, πλῆκεται ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν* C. continues *εἰν δ' ἂν οὖς αἰνίσσεται ἡ προφήτεια καταφερεῖς, ἀκρατεῖς, [οἱ ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν πολεμισταὶ,]*

σκοτὸν καὶ ὀργῆς τέκνα. I think the words in brackets should be omitted as a gloss. [For *καταφερεῖς* read *κατωφερεῖς*, this being the form used elsewhere by C. I. B.]

Ib. εἰάν τις ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος ἢ πόρνος ἢ πλεονέκτης... τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν. For the first ἢ read *ἢ*.

Ib. ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ὥς ἔζων κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστὸς διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐντολῶν ὑπακοῆς [ἀγνῶς καὶ μακαρίως], ὥστε τότε μὲν ἔζων ἐν σαρκὶ σαρκικῶς, ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκὶ ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. Transfer the words in brackets to the end, put a colon before *ὥστε* and omit the second *ἐν σαρκὶ*. In this way we get the proper antitheses, *κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας*)(*διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς* and *ἐν σαρκὶ σαρκικῶς*)(*ἐν πίστει ἀγνῶς*.

§§ 107, 108, p. 561. *ὅπερ ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν ἐδήλωσεν εἰπὼν, τῇ γυναικὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἀποδίδωτω, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρὶ. Μεθ' ἧν ἔκτισεν κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν καὶ τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ πίστιν βροθός, καὶ ἔτι σαφέστερον εἰπὼν κ.τ.λ.* Put a comma after *ἀνδρὶ* and a colon after *βροθός*.

J. B. MAYOR.

NOTE ON INSPUTARIER, PLAUT. CAPT. 550, 553, 555.

FORCELLINI-CORRADINI define: 'insputo idem fere quod inspuere (omitting the examples to come later) ex quo intelligimus non solum evertendi eius morbi causa, sed etiam sanandi, in eum qui laboraret inspuere moris fuisse. Nam saliva hominis in multis vim medicinae habere creditur.' The implicit interpretation here given for the Plautus passages I shall soon cite is based on a passage of Pliny, *H.N.* xxviii. §§ 35, 36: *despuimus comitiales morbos, hoc est contagia regerimus: simili modo et fascinationes repercutimus dextraeque claudicitatis occursum. Veniam quoque a deis spei alicuius audacioris petimus, in sinum spuendo. Eadem ratione terna despuere praedicatione, in omni medicina mos est, atque ita effectus adiuvaré.*

The only occurrences of forms of *insputare* cited by Forc.-Corr. or by Lewis and Short are in Plautus, *Captivi* 547 sq.

TY. Hegio, hic homo rabiosus habitus est invalide

Ne tu quod istie fabuletur auris immittas tuas.

Nam istie hastis insectatus est domi matrem et patrem,

550 Et illic isti qui insputatur¹ morbus interdum venit.

Proin tu ab istoc procul recedas. HE. Ultro istum a me. AR. Ain, verbero?

Me rabiosum atque insectatum esse hastis meum memoras patrem?

Et eum morbum mi esse, ut qui med opus sit insputarier?

HE. Ne verere multos iste morbus homines macerat,

555 Quibus insputari saluti fuit atque ins profuit.

I give the reading of Brix, *Captivi*.¹ Two of Brix's notes will show his understanding of the passage. '547. Tyndarus sucht das Zeugnis des Aristophontes dadurch zu entkräften, dass er ihn für tobsüchtig und epileptisch (550) ausgiebt, das erstere um die Furcht, das zweite um den Ekel des Hegio zu erregen.' '550.

¹ The MSS. sputatur, but the correction seems to me quite certain.

"Die Krankheit wird bespuet" d.h. der mit der Krankheit Behaftete, wie dies Aristophantes selbst 553 versteht. Da die alten Aerzte von diesem Heilmittel nichts berichten, so ist wohl anzunehmen dass es von Plautus zur Erhöhung der komischen Situation erfunden ist. Unter *morbus qui insputatur* pflegt man die Epilepsie zu verstehen, nach Dombart ist es Melancholie, Schwermutswahnsinn, von dem es verschiedene Arten gab, bei einer derselben kamen nach Galen xix. p. 706 auch periodische Tobsuchtsanfälle vor.

The interpretation I am about to suggest is perhaps implied in one form or other by the note of Harrington's edition of the *Captivi*. 'Some suppose that the disease was cured by spitting upon the person afflicted; others, that it was cured by the spitting of the sufferer. Pliny and Mercurialis think that a person in the presence of the disease avoided the contagion by spitting, an instinctive process when we are in the sight of anything offensive. Perhaps, from the fact that those overtaken by the fit recovered soon after the foam appeared, it was thought that this was the means of their cure, and the evil spirit escaped in the foam.'

We need not concern ourselves with the cure of this disease, for we may be sure Tyndarus did not. Brix is, I think, quite right in his insight into the motives of Tyndarus. The insanity (*rabiosus*) was to excite Hegio's fear; the foaming of epilepsy (*qui insputatur morbus*) was to excite his disgust. That his disgust was effectually excited is proved by his cry '*Utro istum a me.*'

I find linguistic and exegetical reasons for taking the verb to be a deponent. (1) *insputarier* is a frequentative verb, and should mean, leaving the preposition unexplained for the present, to keep on spitting. (2) It is fair to interpret any deponent as a reflexive (middle). So interpreted we can translate *insputarier* 'to keep spitting upon one's self,' i.e. 'foam at the mouth,' cf. *lavari* 'to wash oneself,' 'to bathe.' (3) If *insputarier* is a real passive *qui insputatur morbus* implies *aliquis morbum insputat*, which is Brix's interpretation, but does not seem to me to be good grammar, for *inspuo* construes with the dative (Seneca and Plin.) or with *in* + acc. (Seneca), cf. L. and S. s.v. Now Pliny's testimony amounts to nothing

more than *quicumque morbum vidit terna despuat ut contagia regerat*. (4) Pliny's *terna despuere* certainly does not make for the use of a frequentative as much as taking *insputarier* in the sense of 'foam at the mouth.' This sense also supplies a better motive for Hegio's '*Utro istum a me.*' (5) Epileptics do foam at the mouth. (6) So far as I can discover, *insputarier* is to be found in this passage alone. No grammatical difficulty is experienced if we take the verb as deponent: vs. 550 = 'and the foaming disease (epilepsy) sometimes came upon the fellow in yonder land'; vs. 553 = 'and I had a disease that somehow (qui) I must (or it did me good to?) foam at the mouth';¹ vs. 555 'and for these foaming-at-the-mouth is healthful etc. (7) Plautus's readiness in coining words to suit the moment is well known, e.g. *Captivi* 766 *exauspicavi*, 767 *redauspicandum*, 291 *eminor*, 904 *absumedo*. A very trifling circumstance may have determined the form of one of these new words; *insputatur* in vs. 550 is preceded by *fabuletur* vs. 548, and *insectatus est* in vs. 549. The reiteration of forms of *iste* in the three verses suggests the possibility of turning vs. 550 'and in yon land a sickness sometimes comes upon the fellow and he foams-at-the-mouth.'

An objection to the explanation given may be held to lie in Plautus, *Merc.* 1, 2, 30: *Tua causa rupi ramices, iam dulum sputo² sanguinem*, where the active is used. This objection will not hold, for (1) Plautus uses the same verb, now as active, now as deponent, e.g. *Capt.* 548 *fabuletur*, *Miles Glor.* 444 *fabulem*, where *fabuler* might stand as well as far as the metre goes (cf. Brix *ad loc.* and in general cf. Brix on *Mil. Glor.* 172); (2) *sputo* is here construed with an object not a cognate accusative implicit in the middle form of *insputarier*, cf. *fabulor*: *fabulo* (Zumpt, *Lat. Gram.*¹³ 207, *Ann.*).

EDWIN WHITFIELD FAY.

Lexington, Virginia.

Washington and Lee University.

¹ It is perhaps worth noting that this construction reappears in Cicero's Letters. Tyrrell in introduction p. xxii. calls attention to the parallelism of the Letters and comic diction.

² Lewis and Short cite further only Ovid. *M.* 12, 256 *mixtos sputantem sanguine dentes*, possibly a reminiscence of this Plautus passage.

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE *REPUBLIC* OF PLATO.

(Continued from p. 294.)

598 B. ὁ ζωγράφος ζωγραφήσει ἡμῖν σκυτοτόμους, τέκτονας, τοὺς ἄλλους δημιουργούς, περὶ οὐδενὸς τούτων ἐπαίων τῶν τεχνῶν.

We should certainly read (as Ast suggested) the regular phrase, οὐδὲν περὶ τούτων (or τούτων περὶ οὐδὲν) ἐπαίων τῶν τεχνῶν. Cf. 601 B.

598 E. δεῖ δὴ ἐπισκεψασθαι πότερον μμητᾶς τοίοις οὗτοι ἐντυχόντες ἐξηπάτηνται.

The article would be necessary with τοίοις. But μμητᾶς τοίοις will give much better sense and is evidently what Plato wrote.

601 D. Πολλὴ ἄρα ἀνάγκη τὸν χρώμενον ἐκάστω ἐμπειρώτατόν τε εἶναι καὶ ἄγγελον γίνεσθαι τῷ ποιητῇ οἷα ἀγαθὴ ἢ κακὰ ποιεῖ ἐν τῇ χρειᾷ ᾧ χρήται· οἷον αὐλητῆς πον ἐξαγγελεῖ περὶ τῶν αὐλῶν οἱ ἂν ὑπηρετώσιν ἐν τῷ αὐλεῖν καὶ ἐπιτάξει οἷους δεῖ ποιεῖν, ὁ δ' ὑπηρετήσει. Πῶς δ' οὐ; Οὐκοῦν ὁ μὲν εἰδὼς ἐξαγγελεῖ περὶ χρηστῶν καὶ πονηρῶν αὐλῶν, ὁ δὲ πιστεύων ποιήσει; Ναί.

Though A and some other MSS. have οἱ ἂν, the majority have οἷα ἂν, and this was the common reading of editors before Bekker (Schneider). It is to be observed that οἱ ἂν ὑπηρετώσιν ἐν τῷ αὐλεῖν for οἷς χρήται is feebly verbose, and that we seem to want something here after ἐξαγγελεῖ closely corresponding to the οἷα κ.τ.λ. after ἄγγελον γίνεσθαι in the preceding sentence. This would lead us to write οἷα (perhaps οἷα δὴ) ὑπηρετοῦσιν. I cannot however believe that Plato used ὑπηρετοῦσιν here, and then ὑπηρετήσει differently applied in the next line of the same sentence. The occurrence of ὁ δὲ πιστεύων ποιήσει immediately afterwards might suggest ποιήσει in the place of ὑπηρετήσει. On the other hand οἷα ποιοῦσιν would be closely parallel to οἷα ἀγαθὰ ἢ κακὰ ποιεῖ, and οἷα ὑπηρετοῦσιν would seem a less natural construction than πῶς ὑπηρετοῦσιν. Believing therefore that one use of ὑπηρετεῖν grew by a copyist's error out of the other, I should prefer to read οἷα ποιοῦσιν (or ἀποτελοῦσιν, or some such word) and to keep ὑπηρετήσει; but οἷα ὑπηρετοῦσιν and ποιήσει would be much better than the received text.

602 A. Οὐτε ἄρα εἴσεται οὔτε ὀρθὰ δοξάσει ὁ μμητῆς περὶ ὧν ἂν μμητᾶι πρὸς κάλλος ἢ πονηρίαν. Οὐκ ἔοικεν. Χαρίεις ἂν εἴη ὁ ἐν τῇ ποιήσει μμητρικὸς πρὸς σοφίαν περὶ ὧν ἂν ποιῇ. Οὐ πάνν.

χαρίεις κ.τ.λ. needs a particle of connexion, and οὐ πάνν is not quite in harmony with it. Both these faults may be removed by reading <Οὐκοῦν> χαρίεις. Οὐκοῦν fell out from its likeness to ἔοικεν, and its restoration will give us a pair of negative sentences just like the pair preceding.

602 C. καὶ ταῦτὰ καμπύλα τε καὶ εὐθέα ἐν ὕδατι τε θεωμένοις καὶ ἐξω, καὶ κοῦλά τε δὴ καὶ ἐξέχοντα διὰ τὴν περὶ τὰ χρώματα αὐτῶν πλάνην τῆς ὁψεως καὶ πᾶσά τις ταραχὴ δόλη ἡμῖν ἐνοῦσα αὐτῇ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ. Perhaps we should read πᾶσι for πᾶσα, which hardly harmonizes with τις. In Aristotle's *Poetics* 6, 1449 b 36 πᾶσιν is a very probable correction for πᾶσαν.

602 E. τοῦτῳ δὲ (i.e. τῷ λογιστικῷ) πολλάκις μετρήσαντι καὶ σημαίνοντι μείζω ἅπτα εἶναι ἢ ἐλάττω ἕτερα ἐτέρων ἢ ἴσα τὰναντία φαίνεται ἅμα περὶ ταῦτά. Ναί. Οὐκοῦν ἐφαμεν τῷ αὐτῷ ἅμα περὶ ταῦτὰ ἐναντία δοξάζειν ἀδύνατον εἶναι; Καὶ ὀρθῶς γ' ἐφαμεν.

I see no way out of the difficulty of this passage except by reading the genitive τοῦτον δὲ π. μετρήσαντος καὶ σημαίνοντος and supposing that the dative was due to a misapprehension. The words as they stand compel us to take the dative with φαίνεται, and give a sense which is not only false but flatly contradicted by the immediately following sentences. It is not to the rational part that the contrary impression is conveyed, but to another.

603 C. Ὡδε δὴ προθώμεθα· πράττοντας, φαμέν, ἀνθρώπους μμεῖται ἢ μμητρικῇ κ.τ.λ. μή τι ἄλλο παρὰ ταῦτα; Οὐδέν. Ἄρ' οὖν ἐν ἅπασιν τοίοις κ.τ.λ.

For προθώμεθα, which can hardly be right, I suggest ὑποθώμεθα, or perhaps θεώμεθα.

604 A. πολλὰ μὲν τολμήσει φθέγγασθαι, ἂ εἴ τις αὐτοῦ ἀκοῖσι αἰσχύνοιτο' ἂν, πολλὰ δὲ ποιήσει, ἂ κ.τ.λ. Read ποιῆσαι.

604 B. οὐκοῦν τὸ μὲν ἕτερον τῷ νόμῳ ἔτοιμον πείθεσθαι, ἢ ὁ νόμος ἐξηγείται.

Perhaps either τῷ νόμῳ or ὁ νόμος should be omitted. But in view of the words preceding (λόγος καὶ νόμος) I suggest τῷ λόγῳ for τῷ νόμῳ. Cf. the phrase in D οὐκοῦν, φαμέν, τὸ μὲν βέλτιστον τοῦτῳ τῷ λογισμῷ ἐθέλει ἔπεισθαι.

605 C. οἱ γάρ πον βέλτιστοι ἡμῶν ἀκροώμενοι Ὀμήρου ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν τραγωδοποιῶν μμουμένων τιτὰ τῶν ἡρώων ἐν πένθει ὄντα καὶ μακρὰν ῥῆσιν ἀποτείνοντα ἐν τοῖς ὀδυρμοῖς ἢ

κλαίοντάς (καὶ ἄδοντάς MSS.) τε καὶ κοπτομένους, οἷσθ' ὅτι χαίρομεν κ.τ.λ.

A few inferior MSS. have *τινας...όντας...ἀποτείνοντας*, and the change to the plural in the later participles is certainly very awkward. Yet the singular number is the best: only one hero is shown lamenting at a time, Achilles or Ajax. I cannot help suspecting that what Plato really wrote was *ἀκροόμενοι...μιμουμένον...καὶ...ἀποτείνοντος...ἢ κλαίοντός τε καὶ κοπτομένου*. If we can be said to 'hear Homer imitating,' I think we might be said to hear him doing the rest, even *κοπτομένου*.

606 A. For *τότ' ἐστὶ τοῦτο* Madvig would read *αὐτ' ἐστὶ τοῦτο*. Τότε is clearly wrong after the previous *τότε* in the same sentence, and *αὐτὸ* seems clearly right. But I think the order should be inverted and we should read *τοῦτ' ἐστὶν αὐτὸ*, which has the advantage of putting both words in the right place.

606 D. καὶ περὶ ἀφροδισίων δὴ καὶ θυμοῦ καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν ἐπιθυμητικῶν τε καὶ λυπηρῶν καὶ ἡδέων ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, ἃ δὴ φαμεν πάσῃ πράξει ἡμῖν ἔσσεσθαι, ὅτι τοιαῦτα ἡμῶς ἢ ποιητικῇ μίμησις ἐργάζεται· τρέφει γὰρ ταῦτα ἄρδονσα, δέον αἰχμεῖν, καὶ κ.τ.λ.

Ὅτι is bracketed by Baiter. Madvig reads *ἐτι*. Τοιαῦτα can hardly stand as it is, and I should suggest for *ὅτι τοιαῦτα* either *ἔτερα τοιαῦτα*, or *οὐ τὰ αὐτά* (a question). The latter is supported by Glaucon's *οὐκ ἔχω ἄλλως φάναι*, which seems to imply a question preceding. The confusion of *τοιαῦτα*, *τὰ αὐτά*, *ταῦτα* &c. is common. Cf. last note, and on 586 C: 598 E.

607 C. καὶ ὁ τῶν διασόφων ὄχλος κρατῶν.

The quotation from an author unknown is given in this form by Baiter after Schmidt. Most MSS. have *διὰ σοφῶν*: A apparently *δία σοφῶν*, from which many scholars have written *Δία σοφῶν*, some (Schleiermacher, Stallbaum) thinking *Δία* could depend on *σοφῶν*, others (Schneider, Bywater) governing it by *κρατῶν*. No one seems to have seen that the *δία* of A is nothing but an easy corruption of *λίαν* (ΔΙΑ for ΛΙΑ). Cf. Eur. *El.* 296, *γνώμην ἐνείναι τοῖς σοφοῖς λίαν σοφῇ*: *Med.* 295, *παῖδας περισσῶς ἐκδιδάσκεισθαι σοφούς* and 305 *εἰμὶ δ' οὐκ ἄγαν σοφῇ*. As we are dealing with a mere fragment, it would probably be unwise to alter *κρατῶν*, but *κρητῶν* is an obvious conjecture.

608 E. Ἄρ' οὖν ὥσπερ ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν διανοεῖ; Τὸ ποῖον; Τὸ μὲν ἀπολλύν καὶ διαφθείρον πᾶν τὸ κακὸν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ σῶζον καὶ ὠφελούν τὸ ἀγαθόν; Ἐγωγ', ἔφη. Τί δέ; κακὸν κάστω τι καὶ ἀγαθὸν λέγεις, οἷον ὀφθαλμοῖς φθαλμῖαν καὶ ξυμπαντὶ τῷ σώματι νόσον, σίτω εἰρυσίβην κ.τ.λ.

Does not the sense require that with *κακὸν ἐκάστω τι καὶ ἀγαθὸν λέγεις* we should read some such word as *ἴδιον* (610 B) or *οἰκῆον* (609 C: 610 E)? Probably it preceded *οἷον* and fell out through likeness to it.

610 A. *Ἡ τοίνυν ταῦτα ἐξελέγχωμεν ὅτι οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἢ, ὥς ἂν ἢ ἀνεξέλεγκτα, μὴ ποτε φῶμεν κ.τ.λ.

Read *ἐξελεγχθῶμεν*. Cf. *πρὶν ἂν τις ἀποδείξῃ* four lines below.

611 E. περικρονθεῖσα πέτρας τε καὶ ὄστρεα ἃ νῦν αὐτῇ...γεγρά καὶ πετρώδη πολλὰ καὶ ἄγρια περιπέφυκεν.

I think we should get rid of the tautology by omitting *πέτρας τε καὶ ὄστρεα*, as having got in from *ὄστρεά τε καὶ φνκία καὶ πέτρας* in 611 D, or we should at least read <καὶ> ἃ νῦν. If the substantives were right, would they not need an article?

612 A. Οὐκοῦν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, τὰ τε ἄλλα ἀπελυσάμεθα ἐν τῷ λόγῳ καὶ οὐ τοὺς μισθοὺς οὐδὲ τὰς δόξας δικαιοσύνης ἐπηνέκαμεν, ὥσπερ Ἡσιόδῳ τε καὶ Ὀμηρῳ ἡμεῖς ἔφατε.

Ἐπηνέκαμεν (Cobet) or ἐπηνέκαμεν is clearly right as against the old *ἐπηνέκαμεν*; indeed *ἐπηνέκαμεν* seems really to be the final reading of A. But neither the *ἀπελυσάμεθα* of 'the best MSS.' and Stobaeus nor the *ἀπεδυσάμεθα* of other MSS. is at all satisfactory: *ἀπεδυσάμεθα* is not even an Attic prose form. I should say that Plato wrote *τὰ τε ἄλλα ἀπεωσάμεθα*, just as in 366 A he writes *τὰ δ' ἐξ ἀδικίας κέρδη ἀπωσάμεθα*. The corruption of *ω* to *υ* occurs in a fragment of Archilochus (74 in Bergk), where the faulty *λυγρόν* should certainly be changed with Bentley to *ὠγρόν*.

614 B. ἀλκίμων μὲν ἀνδρός, Ἡρὸς τοῦ Ἀρμενίου, τὸ γένος Παμφύλου.

We hardly need Theodoret's quotation of these words to suggest that we must read *τὸ <δε> γένος*. The *διακελεύεσθαι* which he and Eusebius give in 614 D seems decidedly preferable to *διακελεύοντο*.

615 D. οὐχ ἦκει, φάναι, οὐδ' ἂν ἦξει. Read *οὐδὲ δὴ ἦξει* (*Class. Rev.* vi. 339 b).

616 A. τοῖς αἰεὶ παριοῦσι σημαίνοντες ὦν ἕνεκά τε καὶ εἰς ὃ τι τὸν Τάρταρον ἐμπεσοῦμενοι ἄγοντο. A has *εἰς ὃ τι*, all other MSS. apparently *εἰς ὅτι*, and the editors before Hermann *ὅτι εἰς*. Hermann however and Baiter keep *εἰς ὃ τι* and bracket *τὸν Τάρταρον* as a gloss. But is it certain that Plato could have written of a place *εἰς ὃ τι*, instead of *οἱ ὅροι* or *ὅποι*? Cf. *Thuc.* 1, 69, *5 ἐπιστάμεθα οἷα ὁδῶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ ὅτι κατ' ὀλίγον χωροῦσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς πῆλας*. There is some awkwardness there, as here; but does Cobet avoid all awkwardness by bracketing *καὶ ὅτι*? If we

want to do that, we must bracket καὶ ὅτι κατ' ὁλόγον.

618 D. ὥστε ἐξ ἀπάντων αὐτῶν δυνατὸν εἶναι συλλογισάμενον αἰρεῖσθαι πρὸς τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς φύσιν ἀποβλέποντα τὸν τε χεῖρω καὶ τὸν ἀμείνω βίον.

For αἰρεῖσθαι, which gives a quite wrong sense here (it is rightly used ten lines below, τὸν μέσον δὲ τῶν τοιούτων βίον αἰρεῖσθαι), read διαιρεῖσθαι. Cf. βίον καὶ χρηστὸν καὶ πονηρὸν διαγινώσκοντα and διαιρούμενα itself in 618 C.

619 D. διὸ δὴ καὶ μεταβολὴν τῶν κακῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ταῖς πολλαῖς τῶν ψυχῶν γίγνισθαι καὶ διὰ τὴν τοῦ κλήρου τύχην.

Διὸ δὴ...καὶ διὰ is awkward, and worse than awkward, for Plato clearly wrote καὶ <οὐ> διὰ. The words immediately following, εἰ...ὁ κλῆρος αὐτῷ τῆς αἰρέσεως μὴ ἐν τελευταίοις πίπτει, may be quoted against this: but what of 619 B καὶ τελευταίῳ ἐπιόντι, ἐν νῷ ἐλομένῳ, συντόνως ζῶντι κείται βίος ἀγαπητός, οὐ κακός· μήτε ὁ ἄρχων αἰρέσεως ἀμελείτω μήτε ὁ τελευταῖος ἀθυμείτω!—and this is the drift of the whole passage. The ἐπεὶ which follows here after the words cited (and which Davies and Vaughan boldly translate 'but') has no meaning, unless there was an οὐ preceding. The condition thrown in (εἰ...πίπτει) only means that one of the very last choosers cannot expect εὐδαιμονεῖν in the highest degree.

621 B. ἐπειδὴ δὲ κοιμηθῆναι καὶ μέσας νύκτας γενέσθαι, βροντὴν τε καὶ σεισμὸν γενέσθαι.

Is Plato really responsible for the clumsy and ill-sounding repetition of γενέσθαι? As καί and κατά are often confused, perhaps we should write ἐπειδὴ δὲ κοιμηθῆναι, κατὰ μέσας νύκτας βροντὴν τε καὶ σεισμὸν γενέσθαι.

Ibid. ἐξαίφνης ἀναβλέψας ἰδεῖν ἔωθεν αὐτὸν κείμενον ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ. A's marginal ἄνωθεν for ἔωθεν commends itself to me, though no editor seems to have favoured it. The marginal correction in 576 D seems certain and that in 607 D very plausible: cf. too 533 E.

621 C. καὶ ἡμᾶς ἂν σώσειεν. Read καὶ ἡμᾶς δὴ σώσει (*Class. Rev.* vi. 341 a).

Ibid. τῆς αἰῶν ὁδοῦ αἰεὶ ἐξόμεθα καὶ δικαιοσύνην μετὰ φρονήσεως παντὶ τρόπῳ ἐπιτηδεύσομεν, ἵνα καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς φίλοι ὦμεν καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς, αὐτοῦ τε μένοντες ἐνθάδε καὶ ἐπειδὰν τὰ ἄλλα

αὐτῆς κομιζόμεθα, ὥσπερ οἱ νικηφόροι περι-αγειρόμενοι, καὶ ἐνθάδε καὶ ἐν τῇ χιλιέτει πορεύε-σθαι διελθούμεν, εὖ πράττωμεν.

Schneider, who objects on grounds of logic to joining ἵνα...φίλοι ὦμεν...τοῖς θεοῖς...ἐπειδὰν τὰ ἄλλα αὐτῆς κομιζόμεθα, connects αὐτοῦ τε...περιαγειρόμενοι with εὖ πράττωμεν. But his logical objection, though not unfounded, seems to tell with equal strength against saying ἵνα...ἐπειδὰν τὰ ἄλλα αὐτῆς κομιζόμεθα...εὖ πράττωμεν, and in his construction the repetition in καὶ ἐνθάδε is very weak. I conclude therefore that αὐτοῦ τε...περιαγειρόμενοι goes with φίλοι ὦμεν, and indeed the τε and καὶ almost necessarily form a pair. But the meaning would be much more clearly and symmetrically expressed, if we might suppose a τε to have been lost, reading καὶ ἐνθάδε <τε> καὶ ἐν τῇ χιλιέτει πορεύεσθαι...εὖ πράττωμεν. Plato does not avoid such a combination of short syllables: cf. 602 C ἐν ὕδατι τε. For the omission of τε cf. note on 614 B, and here it is made easier by δε preceding.

I take this opportunity of cancelling three suggestions that have been made in this collection of notes. In 369 D I doubted whether the adverb αὐτόσε could stand after προστιθέναι in the sense of 'add,' and suggested αὐτοῖς: Dem. *Ol.* 2, 14 ὅποι τις ἂν προσθῇ οἶμαι κἂν μικρὰν δύναν, πάντ' ὀφέλει shows that it can. In 489 B I took exception to καὶ—τοίνυν, but wrongly: see for instance Dr. Holden's index to the *Oeconomicus* s.v. τοίνυν. Finally I called in question the use of ἀνδρείοτερον ἱατροῦ in contrast with φανλότερον in 459 C, but in reading Isocrates I have found three places where ἀνδρικός seems to be used of purely intellectual characteristics. In 13, 17 he declares various things in the art of composition πολλῆς ἐπιμελείας δεῖσθαι καὶ ψυχῆς ἀνδρικῆς καὶ δοξαστικῆς ἔργον εἶναι, and in 15, 200 he contrasts οἱ ἀφνεῖς (τῶν ῥητόρων) and οἱ τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνδρικὰς ἔχοντες: see also 15, 266. These passages seem to indicate that if in 459 C ἀνδρείοτερον itself is not right, we might be content with ἀνδρικότερον. The two words are confused in Ar. *Peace* 498 and *Knights* 453, where the MSS. give ἀνδρικός and ἀνδρικότατα, while ἀνδρείος and ἀνδρείοτατα are required by the metre.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

THE PROVINCE OF GALATIA.

It has been generally supposed up to our own time that St. Paul's Galatia is the Keltic district in Asia Minor which is always known as Galatia. Lately however Professor Ramsay has found himself compelled 'to understand Galatians as inhabitants of Roman Galatia.' I do not propose to discuss this hypothesis generally, but only to offer a brief criticism of the Professor's view of the name Galatia.

In *The Church and the Roman Empire* (p. 6 note) Professor Ramsay says—'I did not expect to be obliged to argue that this great province [i.e. that which includes, besides Galatia proper, Lycaonia, Isauria, and portions of Phrygia and Pisidia] was called Galatia; but even this simple fact, which has been assumed by every writer since Tacitus, has recently been contested by Dr. Schürer: and I have appended a note on the subject at the end of this chapter.'

As Emil Schürer is a man who says nothing lightly, it was certainly worth while to attempt to refute him. I turn to the note (p. 13). There I find Schürer quoted as saying—'An official usage which embraced all three districts (Galatia, Pisidia, Lycaonia) under the single conception *Galatia* has never existed.' And again—'the name Galatia is only a *parte potiori*, being taken from the biggest of the various districts which were included in the province, and is not an official designation.' On the other side Professor Ramsay alleges (no doubt correctly, though without any quotation of authority) that 'the first governor appointed is called "Governor of Galatia."' What was the Latin or Greek title of this 'governor' does not appear; but at any rate it is not disputed that there was a Roman official who took his designation from Galatia, or that he had jurisdiction over a considerable district outside Galatia proper; but it by no means follows that 'Galatia' was the name, the proper official designation, of his whole jurisdiction. Indeed, Professor Ramsay very candidly supplies evidence that this was not the case. 'Honorary inscriptions,' he says, 'in which it is an object to accumulate titles, speak of the official as

governor of Galatia, Pontus, Paphlagonia, Pisidia, Phrygia, Lycaonia, etc.' There could scarcely be clearer proof that at the date of these honorary inscriptions the name 'Galatia' did not designate a province which included Pisidia, Phrygia, and Lycaonia. We cannot imagine that any desire to 'accumulate titles' would induce the people (for instance) of a city in the Madras Presidency to address their governor as Lieutenant-governor of Madras, Trichinopoly, and Madura, these districts being included in the Presidency. But we can very well suppose that the people of Delhi would address the official in whose jurisdiction they are as 'Chief Commissioner of the Punjab and Delhi,' because, though Delhi is under his authority, it is never spoken of as being in the Punjab.

But 'inscriptions found in the extreme parts of Galatic Pisidia and Galatic Lycaonia mention the governor of the district as governor of Galatia.' If this were the case, it would afford (it seems to me) a slight presumption that Pisidia and Lycaonia were not included in a province called Galatia; for if they had been it would have been more natural to speak of the governor as governor 'of this province' or 'of our province.' But in the inscriptions as given by Professor Ramsay (I know them only in his quotation) we do not find 'Galatia,' but 'the Galatic province.' Is this a synonym for 'Galatia'? If this is really the case, it is difficult to imagine why the simple word 'Galatia' was not used. It is not—so far as my small observation goes—at all usual in the 'lapidary' style to use needless amplification. But if Schürer's supposition is correct, that there was no Roman province called Galatia, the 'Galatic' province is a natural designation for the region governed from Galatia, but not wholly included in Galatia.

On the whole, I come to the conclusion that Professor's Schürer's view has much in its favour, and that Professor Ramsay's arguments against it are very far from conclusive.

S. CHEETHAM.

ἁρμονία AND Τόνος IN GREEK MUSIC.

IN the interesting and instructive volume on the *Modes of Ancient Greek Music*, lately published by the Clarendon Press, the Provost of Oriel maintains that there was no such distinction as that which Westphal and others have drawn between ancient Greek 'modes' (ἁρμονίαι) and 'keys' (τόνοι or τρόποι). Among the reasons which Mr. Monro adduces in support of their identity is the fact that Plutarch was apparently not aware of any difference of meaning between τόνος and ἁρμονία (*l.c.*, p. 26). This is inferred from a comparison of three passages in his

treatise *De Musica*, cc. 15-17, cc. 6 and 8, and c. 19. May I be permitted to point out that it appears to be (if possible) still more clearly proved by another passage in the same author? In the tract *De E apud Delphos*, c. 10, p. 389 e, Plutarch incidentally mentions πέντε τοῖς πρώτοις, εἴτε τόνους ἢ τρόπους εἶθ' ἁρμονίας χρή καλεῖν, ὡς ἐπιτάσσει καὶ ὑφέσει τρεπομένων κατὰ τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον αἱ λοιπαὶ βαρύτητές εἰσι καὶ ὀξύτητες. Here Plutarch obviously regards the 'modes' as synonymous with the 'keys.'

J. E. SANDYS.

THE MUSIC OF THE ORESTES.

IN his article on the Orestes papyrus in the last number of this *Review*, pp. 313-317, Mr. Abdy Williams has been following Dr. Wessely with rather too much confidence. The transcript will not bear examination.

1. He says that the notes for the accompaniment are mingled with the text. That would be unprecedented. In the nine fragments from Delphi with notes for instruments the notes are written above the text; and so also in the Kircher and Marcello MSS. He says that the notes here are Ϛ, ϛ, and Ζ. Whenever the so-called Ζ occurs in the text, it comes between the last word of one verse and the first word of the next verse; so this must be a species of κορονίς for marking off the verses. The Ϛ and ϛ occur, with other fragments of letters, in the interval between κατέκλυσεν and ὡς πόντου, where δεινὸν πόνον should be read; so they are blunders of the scribe. Obviously, the scribe was puzzled by the half-verse ἀνὰ δὲ λαΐφος ὡς, and completed it with the half-verse τις ἀκάτου θοῶς, beginning the next verse at τυάξας and adding the Ζ above the line. And then he made this muddle of the text, beginning a fresh verse at ὡς πόντου with the Ζ again above the line.

2. Mr. Abdy Williams says that the ictus dot is placed above the musical sign, or alongside it, according to exigencies of space. It is always above the punctuating Ζ, and alongside the musical sign that follows the Ζ. Thus, Ζ and Ρ· in lines 1, 2; Ζ and Ι·

in 3, 4, and again in 5, 6, and 11; and Ζ and Φ· in 7. Thus the plain dot marks the first note in a verse, while the combined dot and dash mark the first note in the fourth foot. The dot and dash occur in lines 5, 7, 9, as printed in the transcript; and a photograph shows traces of them above the first Π in line 1. They are required above the first Ζ in line 3, but here the photograph shows hardly any traces of the Ζ itself.

3. In determining the values of the notes, he treats the μα in ματέρος as a short syllable; the χεν in ἀναβακχεύει, the δαι in δαίμων, and the πον in πόντου, as two short syllables each; the word ὡς as two long syllables; and the ϰων in δεινὸν as a short and a long. No doubt the ὡς is split, for this is written as ὡος: but if the other syllables were split, they would be written accordingly. Moreover, a long syllable always splits into two shorts, as may be seen from the Delphic hymns.

4. As regards the notes for voices, he follows the usual system in giving *e* for ϛ, *g* for Φ, *a* for C, *d* for Ι, and *e* for Ζ. But he gives *f* for Ε, whereas Ε was the lower of the two notes that came between *e* and *f*; and in line 11 he treats the punctuating Ζ as a note for voices. He also gives *b* for Π and makes P a quarter-tone between *b* and *a*. This involves the enharmonic scale with intervals of a quarter of a tone apiece; but the notation will also suit the chromatic scales with intervals of three-

eighths or a third of a tone apiece, besides other chromatic and enharmonic scales with more complicated intervals.

5. As regards the alleged notes for instruments, he follows the usual system in giving *g* for Ζ. But he gives *f* for Γ, whereas Γ was a note between *e* and *f*; and he also gives *b* for Δ, thereby involving the enharmonic scale with intervals of a quarter of a tone apiece.

6. He transcribes the music into the no-

tation that is now in use; and this is associated with an octave of twelve equal intervals. But in Greek music the intervals were not the same; so the notes are not exactly in their places.

The comparisons with modern music appear to be illusory. They are not founded on the ancient music as it stands, but on a transcript which twists it into modern shape.

CECIL TORR.

NOTE ON THE HOMERIC HYMN TO HERMES V. 33.

IN the current *Hermathena*, in a review of Goodwin's *Homeric Hymns* among other conjectures I have put forward one (on *Hermes* v. 33) which has been fortunate enough to command the assent of many of my friends. I avail myself here of the courtesy of the Editor of the *Classical Review* to make a slight improvement on it. The note ran thus:—

In v. 33 there is, as it seems to us, room for a certain conjecture, though, strange to say, the needfulness of a correction has not struck any of the editors. Hermes, addressing the tortoise out of whose shell he afterwards fashioned the lyre, exclaims:—

πόθεν τόδε, καλὸν ἄθρυμα,
αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἔσσο, χέλυσ ὄρεσι ζώουσα;

But 'how came it that thou art a shell?' is unmeaning. Read *ἔσσο* for *ἔσσι*. The tortoise was not the shell much more than a man is his great-coat. One is reminded of the joke ascribed to Mr. Gilbert when in reply to 'You wear a great-coat?' he said, 'No, I never was.' But 'thou art clothed with this shell' at once recalls the *λάινον ἔσσο χιτῶνα* of Γ 57.

The punctuation given above, which is that of most editions, compels us to give to *πόθεν* the sense of *qui fit ut*? not of *unde*? Now this sense of *πόθεν* is posthomeric.

This is not a serious objection, for every reader of the hymns knows that they abound in posthomeric usages. But a slight change of punctuation improves the construction; read:—

πόθεν τόδε καλὸν ἄθρυμα;
αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἔσσο χέλυσ ὄρεσι ζώουσα.

'Whence this pretty plaything? Curiously wrought (or, sheeny,) is the shell wherewith thou art clothed upon, thou tortoise of the field.' The punctuation which I now recommend is, I find, that of Gemoll's edition.

It would be quite impossible with the ordinary punctuation to take *πόθεν ἔσσι* together = *unde es*? To this *τόδε* is fatal; *τοῦτο* would be awkward, but *τόδε* would not be Greek, unless we could write *πόθεν ὅδε σοφός* Εὐριπίδης (or *ὅδε σοφὸς Εὐριπίδη*) εἰ; Besides, the coupling together in apposition of *ἄθρυμα*, *ὄστρακον*, *χέλυσ*, would be ungraceful to the point of unintelligibility. The words *αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἔσσι* would of necessity supply the predicate.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

THE MODERN GREEK WORD *νερό*.

IN a note in the *Classical Review* of March (p. 100) Mr. A. N. Jannaris says that the modern Greek word *νερό* has no connexion with the ancient *νηρό*, *Νηρεύς*, but is nothing but a phonetic modification of *νεαρόν* 'fresh,' sc. *ἔδωρ*. I should like to point out that Prof. Krumbacher at Munich, three years ago, proposed the same etymo-

logy. In the edition of the *Colloquium Pseudo-Dositheanum Monacense* inserted by Krumbacher in the *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, W. von Christ dargebracht (München, 1891), p. 362 seqq. (in a note to 'πῶμεν νερόν ἐκ τοῦ βαρκιδίου bibamus recentem de gillone'), we find the explanation of *νερόν* from *νεαρόν*

supported by good arguments. Further Mr. Hatzidakis, discussing the etymology in a criticism of Krumbacher's paper ('*Αθηνά* iv. 466), completes the arguments of Krumbacher, showing that the contraction of *εα* to *η* (*νεαρόν*—*νηρόν*—*νερόν*) is attested by ancient authority. Moreover Hatzidakis

refers to Korais' *Ἀτακτα*, iv. 349 and Sophocles' well-known *Lexicon*. Both these writers suggest (though without arguing the question) that *νερό* may possibly be identical with the ancient Greek word *νεαρόν*.

ALBERT THUMB.

Freiburg-i.-B.

EUR. *ION* 1276.

ὁ δ' οἷκτος ὁ σὸς ἐμοὶ κρείσσων πάρα
καὶ μητρὶ τῇ μῇ.

These words should naturally mean 'But pity for thee is stronger in my heart and that of my mother,' a sense absolutely irreconcilable with the context. Ion is threatening Creusa with instant and certain death:

ἀλλ' οὔτε βωμὸς οὔτ' Ἀπόλλωνος δόμος
σώσει σ'.

are the words immediately preceding; and there is no sign of relenting in what follows.

In order to make the line fit into its context, editors are reduced to translating (as Paley) 'The feeling of pity for you is stronger for myself and my mother,' a rendering adopted also by Dr. Verrall in his poetical version. But it is hard to see how the words can possibly be so construed. I would suggest the Epic *οἶτος*, used by Sophocles (*El.* 167) and Euripides (*I.T.* 1091, where Dind. has *οἰκτρόν*) in lyric passages, with the sense 'But thy doom is present as a mightier desire (than reverence for Apollo) with me and my mother.'

FRANK CARTER.

DELBRÜCK'S COMPARATIVE SYNTAX.

Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Von KARL BRUGMANN und BERTHOLD DELBRÜCK. Dritter Band. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Von B. DELBRÜCK. Erster Theil. Strassburg. Karl J. Trübner. 1893. M. 20.

This is a book to which it is out of place here to apply the general language of eulogy. The time will come when it will be interesting and proper to call attention to the qualities which distinguish Delbrück among the great scholars who have built up the science of comparative grammar. At present our business is simply to give such an account of the work as will be of service to those who intend to study and use it.

The author begins with a sketch of the history of syntax. Three periods are distinguished. The first is that of the ancient Greek grammarians. The second begins with the twelfth century, when education in western Europe derived its substance

from the doctrines of the Church, and its formulas from a Latinized version of Aristotle. Here we find the early history of such terms as 'subject,' 'predicate,' 'governing,' 'concord,' &c. After the Renaissance the growth of philosophy led to the conception of 'universal grammar,' and to such theories as that of the derivation of the grammatical cases from local relations ('where,' 'whence,' 'whither'). The third period is that of the modern science of language, founded by Bopp, whose treatment of the infinitive in his *Conjugationssystem* (1816) may be regarded as the beginning of comparative syntax. Since that time the most marked change in the method of comparative grammar has been the limitation of its first aims. To Bopp and even to G. Curtius it seemed possible not merely to reconstruct the original or 'Indo-germanic' language but to explain the formation of that language from its elements. The latter of these aims is now recognized as hopeless: indeed the comparative method is inapplicable

able to it. We compare the members of the family of languages in order to arrive at the original mother-tongue: but when we have reached that mother-tongue we find no term of further comparison.

After this introductory matter the author addresses himself first to the problems of gender. Does the gender of nouns depend on their meaning? In Latin, for example, why are the names of rivers masculine, and those of trees feminine? On this point it appears that there is nothing to be learned from comparative grammar, since the phenomena in question cannot be traced back to the period of Indo-germanic unity. On the other hand the rule that stems in *-o* are masculine or neuter, and stems in *-ā* feminine, was originally an absolute one, numerous as are the exceptions in Greek and Latin. How then do we account for the gender of such words as *ταμίας*, *πολίτης*, *scriba*, *scurra*? Or again of such words as *ὄδός*, *ῥήσος*? The former question was touched upon in Delbrück's earlier *Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*, but now receives a more complete discussion. The source of the change of gender, he points out, lies in a change of meaning. The commonest case is when a feminine abstract denoting an action comes to be used as a noun of the agent. Thus there was doubtless a noun *ταμία* which meant 'cutting up,' and so 'dispensing,' stewardship. In Homer we find a change of meaning, but not of gender, *γυνὴ ταμὶς* being used in the sense of a housekeeper. Finally, when the steward was usually a man, the further step was taken of making the word masculine and adding the characteristic *-s* to the nominative. Similarly *ναυίας* presupposes a collective or abstract *ναυία*. Most of the Latin masculines in *-a* are either words expressing some action or employment, as *scriba*, *papa*, *auriga*, *lixa*, &c., or contemptuous terms, as *scurra*, *gumia*, &c. Some are borrowed from Greek, e.g. *nauta*, *poeta*, and these may point, as Delbrück suggests, to Greek forms *ναύτᾱ*, *ποιητᾱ* (without final *-s*). This hypothesis may perhaps be supported by the Boeotian and Elean masculines in *-ā* (as to which see Meister i. 160); but we must reckon with the probability that the borrowed words would follow the analogy of the native Latin *scriba*, &c. The change of meaning from abstract to concrete may be illustrated within Latin by such uses as *magistratus* 'magistracy,' then 'magistrate.' Probably it began with the use of the word as a title or epithet: cp. the Greek *ἱππότα* Πηλεΐς, ἡπύτα κῆρυξ, &c., also βίη Πριάμοιο

and the like. Thus it is ultimately the same change of meaning that we see in *bahuvrihi* compounds (*swift-foot* for *swift-footed*, &c.). Delbrück adds apposite parallels from the Balto-Slav languages. On p. 109, l. 24, 'das Lateinische' is surely a misprint for 'das Litauische.'

After *gender* comes *number*. In dealing with the dual the German language has the advantage of possessing in the words *beide* and *zwei* the same distinction as that which obtained between the dual and the plural as used of two objects. In Greek, however, even as early as Homer, the plural had begun to encroach on the province of the dual. Regarding the loss of the dual Delbrück makes the interesting suggestion that it was caused by the use of the words *ἄμφω* and *δύο*. These words expressed the dual idea in a clear and uniform manner, which was gradually adopted in preference to the complicated system of dual-endings.

In regard to the plural the chief interest is to be found in the words which show more or less difference of meaning between singular and plural. The reason usually lies in the nature of the object. It may be one which does not admit of a true plurality: as *aes* 'brass' (*aera* 'pieces of brass'), *κλέος* 'fame' (*κλέεα* 'deeds of fame'). Or it is composed of parts which may be treated as a plurality: hence *στήθος* or *στήθεα* 'the breast,' *τόξον* or *τόξα* 'a bow.' The difficulty is further illustrated by a class of nouns treated by Delbrück under the head of gender, viz. those which are masculine in the singular and neuter in the plural. This class, which appears to go back to the Indo-germanic period, may be exemplified by Greek *μηρός* *μήρα*, *κέλευθος* *κέλευθα*, *Τάρταρος* *Τάρταρα*, Latin *locus* *loca*, *jocus* *joca*, &c. In these cases it is evident that the plural is a kind of collective noun, denoting a whole set or mass of things, not a true plurality: e.g. *loca* does not mean places (*loci*), but 'a region.' This is a shade of meaning by no means unknown with masculine and feminine plurals (cp. the Latin *finēs*, *sales*, *nugae*, *tenebrae*, *divitiae*), but it is especially noticeable in the neuter. It is needless to refer to the use which Joh. Schmidt has made of these facts.

Under the head of the 'elliptic plural' Delbrück notices the use of *ἐνέχυρᾱς* = 'the father-in-law and those who belong to him.' The use, he observes, is a rare one. We may compare the Homeric *νῶς ἀνδρῶν αἰχμητῶν* (*Il.* iii. 49), also Virgil's *hospitibus quondam socerisque vocatis* (*Aen.* xi. 105),

applied to the Latin nation in their relation to Aeneas.

The chapters dealing with the cases are introduced by a short statement of the doctrine of the Indian grammarians, with a comparison of their views with modern theory. The rest of the chapter treats of the process of development or rather decay which is called 'syncretism'—the amalgamation of two or more cases by the use of a common form. This is the process by which in Greek the ablative has been absorbed into the genitive, and the locative and instrumental into the dative; while in Latin the locative, instrumental, and ablative have formed one case. The same thing happened at a still earlier period to the nominative and accusative of the neuter. As Delbrück points out, the nominative probably was the case of the agent, and a neuter, which denoted an object without life, could not be regarded as an agent. In a more developed grammar, when the nominative might be used for a mere grammatical subject, the accusative neuter came to be employed as a nominative. For somewhat similar reasons in the dual and plural the nominative was used for the vocative.

The further steps by which in modern Greek the dative has been absorbed in the genitive had begun to be taken in the ancient Iranian language. In the pronominal declension the two cases agreed in some of their forms from a very early period. Delbrück [p. 482] would recognize traces of this in the Homeric use of *οἱ*, as in *Il.* xvi. 531 *οἱ δὲ ἦκουσεν μέγας θεὸς εὐχαίμενοι*. But the *dativus commodi* in Homer is surely elastic enough to cover such uses. In general it may be remarked that syncretism is confined in Greek and Latin to the three cases which have a distinctly local meaning, the locative, ablative, and instrumental. The reason of this is happily explained by Delbrück. These are the cases whose meaning can be at once expressed by simple prepositions—*in*, *from*, *with*: and whenever these prepositions are employed, the case-ending becomes superfluous, and is soon neglected. In the Aryan languages, in which the locative survives in full vigour, there is no preposition with the meaning 'in.' In Greek, on the other hand, the process of supplanting the case has gone so far that even in Homer the use of it is no longer free, but is confined to certain groups of words.

The treatment of the dative offers a good example of the changes of view which may be observed in the recent history of com-

parative grammar. Delbrück reminds us (p. 185) that a quarter of a century ago (*K. Z.* xviii. 100 ff.) he explained the fundamental meaning of the dative to be the quasi-local one of a leaning in the direction of an object, and traced this meaning back to the original formation of the case. He now confesses to a decided distrust of all 'glottogonic' hypotheses, and also to a freedom from prejudice in favour of local explanations of the cases. Looking simply at the facts, he regards the dative as probably the case of that for which something is done (*dem der Verbalbegriff gilt*). In this way he explains the circumstance that the dative is mainly used of *persons*, which would hardly be if it were the case of the *end* of action. It follows that in such a construction as *πεδίῳ πέσε* 'fell on the ground' he does not find a true dative, but a locative, as in the Latin *adveniēns domi*, or *procumbit humi*. He admits indeed that *caelo* in the phrase *it caelo clamor* is a dative of the end of motion, but regards it as modelled on uses like *mittere leto*. A nearer approach to the final dative is seen in some Attic inscriptions in which we find phrases such as *ξύλα καὶ ἄνθρακες τῷ μολύβδῳ* 'wood and charcoal for the lead,' *i.e.* for smelting it.

In dealing with the genitive it will be found that Delbrück is inclined to a view which is equally removed from the prevailing tendencies of the last few years and from the earlier local theory. The suggestion that the genitive ending did not originally express any such notion as that of the prepositions 'of' or 'from' appears to have been first made by Höfer (*Lautelehre*, p. 92), who proposed to connect the ending *-osyo* with that of adjectives like *δημόσιος*, and thus to prove the genitive to be a sort of undeclined adjective. A similar view was put forward in a more subtle and plausible form by Curtius in his *Chronologie* (p. 69). According to him, the genitive ending being a pronoun, the whole word was a kind of compound, so that (*e.g.*) *ὄν-ός* was literally *voice-that*, or 'that of the voice.' And even now that this hypothesis would generally, and doubtless rightly, be regarded as too 'glottogonic,' the view of the genitive as an 'adnominal' case, *i.e.* as expressing the dependence of a noun upon another noun, not (as with the other cases) upon a verb, may be said to be the generally accepted one. Delbrück now rejects this view. In the chapter which treats of the fundamental notions of the cases he points out (p. 186) that there is also an adnominal dative, which is generally regarded as having been de-

veloped from the 'adverbial' use. How then, he asks, if the adnominal genitive arose from a similar, only much earlier, change?

What was the fundamental notion of the 'adverbial' genitive? Delbrück accepts the definition given by C. Gaedicke (*Der Akkusativ im Veda*), according to which the substantive is put in the genitive when the notion given in the verb does not extend to or affect the whole of it. This account of the matter was originally put forward by Grimm, and was adopted by Delbrück in his earlier volume on Greek syntax. What is new in his present treatment is the disposition to regard this partial affecting of the substantive by the verb as the oldest meaning of the genitive, from which the ordinary possessive and other adnominal uses are derived. The question is not one which can be discussed here, especially as Delbrück himself does not put his arguments into a controversial form. Apparently he is influenced chiefly by the general analogy of the case-system, which would make it unlikely that any one case was formed in a wholly different way from the rest. He insists also with much force on the probability that the original conception of a case was not a vague and general notion, such as 'belonging to,' but a comparatively definite one—in this instance the partitive use—from which others were obtained by continued imitation and slight changes of usage (p. 333). In his treatment of particular uses we may notice the account of the genitive with verbs of *emotion* (χάομαι, κορέω, ἄγχνυμαι, φθονέω, &c.), which he regards as probably ablative. The reason is that Sanscrit verbs of *fearing* take an ablative. It seems difficult however to separate verbs expressing emotion from those of *thinking, caring, &c.*, such as μέδομαι, ἀλέγω, κήδομαι (p. 313). Classical scholars will be interested by the Slavonic use of the genitive singular instead of the accusative when the object is a living being (p. 319). Delbrück's explanation of these as partitive genitives gives real support to his theory of the partitive sense as the original nucleus of the case.

In the numerous points which arise with regard to the other cases the reader will be chiefly struck by the care with which every possibility is duly considered and admitted. There is no trace of the feeling that some one solution of a difficulty must be chosen for the sake of a *finis litium*. Examples of this suspense of judgment will be found in the account of the Greek dative with verbs

of *ruling*, which may be a true dative, an instrumental, or a locative (p. 286), and with verbs of *trusting*, which is probably an instrumental, but may be a locative or (when the object is a person) a true dative. In phrases like μάχη (ἀγορῇ, &c.) νικᾶν it is duly noted that the dative may be locative or instrumental. Regarding the idiom in phrases of the type αὐτοῖσιν ὄχεσθαι 'chariot and all' there is a characteristic passage. Delbrück had noticed the difficulty of seeing why in this idiom the combination with αὐτός should have preserved the original instrumental or 'comitative' use. Various scholars expressed the opinion that αὐτός originally went with the governing word, and was drawn to the subordinate word by a kind of attraction (αὐτός τοῖς ὄχεσθαι = the man with his chariot). But this, as Delbrück drily observes, is only a confession, clothed in historical form, that we are surprised to find αὐτός going with the subordinate notion when it ought to go with the principal subject of the sentence. The considerations put forward by the present reviewer (*Homeric Grammar*, § 144 note) are also insufficient, as Delbrück says, to explain the supposed attraction. But is there any such attraction? The point of αὐτός in the phrase (ἵπποι) αὐτοῖσιν ὄχεσθαι is that the horses were not separated from their chariot—that the chariot was there *as before*. So when a man returns αὐτὰ κέλευθα he goes his way *as before*. If this is the force of αὐτός, it belongs properly to the accompanying object.

Regarding the cases in -φ(ν) Delbrück has now satisfied himself that this form belongs properly and originally to the plural. The use of πασσαλόφῃ, ἐσχαρόφῃ, ζυγόφῃ, κεφαλῇφῃ, and a few others as instrumental singular is connected with the *archaic* character which the ending undoubtedly had in the time of Homer. We have also to reckon with the chance that some of these forms do not belong to the original text: it is probable (e.g.) that αὐτόφῃ has sometimes crept in in place of αὐτόθι.

In the chapters on the adjectives and pronouns it is peculiarly difficult to pick out topics for notice in a short review. On the interesting subject of the reflexive pronoun Delbrück is very reserved. He holds the balance impartially between the critical scholars who looked upon isolated forms as blunders to be corrected, and the comparative grammarians who treasure them as survivals. Perhaps some progress may be made by keeping apart the two questions: (1) what evidence is there in the Homeric

text of a wider use of the reflexive stem *σφο-*! and (2) is the use for the first and second persons due to an original wide reflexive sense, or to extension of a narrower use? The possibility of such an extension is obvious enough: cp. the modern Greek *ἐκτύπησα τὸν ἑαυτὸν μου* 'I struck myself.' And surely the use of a pronoun as a 'general reflexive' is less likely to be primitive than the narrower and more definite use for the third person.

The chapter on the adverbs is a kind of appendix to the discussion of the cases. Delbrück excludes words which have no recognizable suffix (e.g. *χθές*, *cras*), or have a suffix which belongs properly to the pronouns or numerals (*-θεν*, *-θι*, *-tus*, &c.). Consequently the essence of an adverb is that it is a case-form of a noun which has come to be used in a special isolated way—which is, so to speak, petrified (*erstarrt*). The process of *Erstarrung*—a word for which we have no good translation—is finely analysed, and the chief instances are enumerated. Much of this is now familiar, but a few points may be noted. Delbrück still explains the adverbs in *-ως* as ablatives, notwithstanding the phonetic difficulties pointed out by Brugmann. The exact correspondence in use between Sanscrit *yād*, *tād* and Greek *ὧς*, *τῶς* appears to him decisive. Thus he takes *οὕτως* as an ablative, *οὕτω* as an instrumental. The meaning in both instances has been generalized so as practically to coincide (p. 559, 580). On the other hand the Doric forms such as *ὧ* 'whence' are ablatival, answering in form (not in meaning) to the Attic *οὗ*, the meaning 'where' being expressed in Doric by the forms *εἰ*, *πεῖ*, &c. The forms in *-η* or *-η* present a peculiar difficulty. Originally (as in the Cretan dialect of Gortyn) there were adverbs in *-η* meaning 'where' or 'whither,' and adverbs in *-α* meaning 'how,' 'in what way.' With the Ionic change of *α* to *η*, and the tendency to omit *subscriptum* in MSS., it is no longer possible to distinguish these groups. In favour of the forms *λάβη* and *πάνη* Delbrück has taken from Joh. Schmidt an argument which unfortunately is not conclusive. It had been pointed out by Hartel (*Hom. Studien* ii. 5) that in the first four books of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* final *-η* is shortened before a vowel forty-one times, and *-η* only nineteen times. Joh. Schmidt

observed that the final vowel of *λάβη* and *πάνη* is frequently shortened in this way, and inferred that in Homer it ought to be written without *subscriptum*. He omitted to notice another table given by Hartel on the same page to show the relative frequency of different final vowels and diphthongs. From this table it appears that *-η* is three times as frequent as *-η*. Consequently the shortening of *-η* is relatively commoner than the shortening of *-η*, and the argument for *λάβη*, *πάνη* falls to the ground.

The last part of the volume (pp. 643–774) is devoted to the prepositions. The space will not seem excessive when we consider the peculiar value which they have for the purpose of comparative grammar. In no other class of words have we such opportunities of observing original agreement in contrast to later growth and consequent divergence of usage. Delbrück arranges his matter from the points of view given by the distinctions (1) between 'pro-ethnical' and 'ethnical' grammar, and (2) between the use with the verb and the use with a governed noun. These uses he distinguishes by the words *Praeverbium* and *Praeposition*. It may be objected perhaps that terms of this kind would be more properly applied to two distinct classes of words than to two different uses of the same class. In his *Altindische Syntax* he assumed that every preposition was originally an adverb, and as such had a meaning which was 'free,' i.e. did not depend upon the verb of the sentence. For instance, *ἀτι* meant 'beyond measure,' *ἀδχι* meant 'besides,' &c. He has now retracted or at least modified this view, and holds that the free adverbial use is in all cases a later development from the use as a *Praeverbium*. Thus the use of *περί* in the adverbial sense of 'exceedingly' is not original, but is due to the fact that with certain verbs (*εἰμί*, *γίγνομαι*, &c.) *περί* formed combinations meaning 'to be in excess,' 'to be superior.' The observation is an acute and important one; but it is hard to see how we can define a *Praeverbium* (not yet attached to a verb) so as to distinguish it logically from an adverb. The main point is to understand the profound gulf which historically separates the Indo-germanic prepositions from the case-forms out of which the adverbs were developed.

D. B. MONRO.

[The following review from unavoidable causes has been very long delayed, but the number of interesting and important points which it discusses makes it hardly necessary to apologize for its insertion now.—ED.]

PROFESSOR JEBB'S EDITION OF THE *TRACHINIAE* OF SOPHOCLES.

SOPHOCLES.—*Trachiniae*. Part V. of the *Plays and Fragments*, with Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose, by R. C. JEBB. Cambridge University Press. 1892. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d.

THIS volume of Professor Jebb's magnificent edition of Sophocles has been in the hands of scholars too long to require any formal expression of praise from the present reviewer. Its merits are those of the entire series. One marks throughout the same delicacy of touch, the same erudition, the same insight into the poet's thought, the same elegance and purity of language, that have won for this edition of Sophocles the first place in the esteem of scholars of both continents. I would not by criticism of details disparage in the slightest degree the fine workmanship of the whole. Professor Jebb has encouraged critics by his generous treatment of their suggestions in his revision of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. I trust therefore that I shall not be misunderstood if in the following review I give an undue prominence to certain omissions, or blemishes, as they seem to me, in a work that as a whole commands nothing but praise.

The report of the MSS. is not invariably correct. Most noticeable perhaps is the report of L's reading of v. 129: 'πήμα καὶ χαρὰ made from πήματι καὶ χαρᾷ.' But there was never room for *τι* between *πήμα* and *καὶ*, where there are traces of a slight erasure, and *τι* was added by the corrector above the *η*. The accent that now stands on *χαρᾷ* (') shows that the original grave was changed to a circumflex, not *vice versa*, at the same time that the *ι* was added. The note then should read 'πήματι (*τι* written small over *η*) καὶ χαρᾷ, made from πήμα καὶ χαρὰ.' It will be seen that the corrected reading distinctly favours the dative, and is against Professor Jebb's ἐπι-κυκλοῦσιν in *imesis*. The correction proposed by Gleditsch (not noticed by Professor Jebb) is simple and satisfactory—ἐπὶ πήμασιν χαρὰι. On 622 we read: 'τὸ μὴ οὐ A: τὸ μὴν (*sic*) L, made from τὸ μὴ οὐ.' But, in spite of Subkoff's report to the same effect, I believe that L has *μὴν*. The corrector tried to unite

μὴ οὐ by crasis, but was no more successful than in *O. C.* 566, where the result is *μ' οὐ*. *ν* standing alone is almost invariably written *ν*. The letter here is exactly like that in *βίον* 942, where Wakefield's emendation to *βίον* was necessary. This point is of interest as showing how easily *οὐ* after *μὴ* falls out altogether, as in this passage in four of the MSS. When it has disappeared in L, Professor Jebb, contrary to the practice of most editors, refuses to restore it (τὸ μὴ οὐ in 90 is an oversight). Minor errors in reporting L are more frequent, e.g.: 720 ταύτη (J. ταύτη), 969 χρὴ θανόντα νῦν (J. χρὴ θανόντα νῦν), 1062 κ' οὐκ ἀνδρὸς (J. κοῖκ ἀνδρὸς), 1091 δε κείνοι (J. δε (*sic*) κείνοι). A is not credited with the accepted reading *ἀεὶ* in vv. 16 and 28, ἀναμπλάκην in 118, ἐπέροχον 1096, ἀ δέ 650, nor is it recorded that L's reading κοῖχι Ἀνδρία in 432 is supported by five other MSS., while the reading adopted, κοῖχ ἡ Ἀνδρία, is supported by only A and R (Subkoff). One would infer quite the contrary from the report 'κοῖχ ἡ A, etc.: κοῖχ L.' In view of the trouble that critics have had with v. 809 τείσται 'Ερινός τ' εἰ θέμις δ' ἐπειχόμεναι, it would have been well to notice the omission of δ' in B and V (Blaydes). This favours Axt's excellent emendation of δ' to γ' with a comma after 'Ερινός τ', which gives the best sense, though it is not noticed by Jebb. K gives ἐμμέμονεν in 982 (Subkoff), which Erfurdt had restored, and which many editors read in preference to L's ἐμμέμονε. In 1161 αἶδον was at first omitted and afterwards added above the line by first hand.

An editor has the right to decide for himself how minutely he shall report the minor mistakes in the MSS. Professor Jebb reports innumerable mistakes in writing accents and breathings, *ν* movable and *ι* subscript, and corrections of the diorthotes, often when no especial reason is apparent. The student is grateful for this, and for any information that will help him to understand the peculiarities of L. Not every student has access to Professor Jebb's summary of L's orthographical peculiarities contained in the introduction to the Auto-

type Facsimile. It seems to me that the following also deserve mention: 127 *θαντοῖς* made from *θανάτοις*, 302 τὰ νῦν, which Nauck, Wecklein, Subkoff and others prefer to τανῦν, 757 οἰκαῖος corrected to οἰκέος, 844 ἐπ' (α supra ε) ἀλλοθρόον, the first being a kind of mistake that justifies Triclinius's ἐπέμολε for ἀπέμολε in 855 and Wakefield's ἀφορᾶ for the objectionable ἐφορᾶ in 1270 (which Jebb keeps without comment), 313 οἶδε and 730 ἐστίν, where the metre requires οἶδεν and ἐστ'. One would infer from the note on 1219, 'παρθένοι] παρὶον L, with θ over α,' that this is a correction, not a contraction. Nothing is said about the similar contraction in 148, nor of the contractions of πατήρ. Just as the practice of contracting the latter word justifies Lachmann's emendation of προσ to πατρός in *O. T.* 1100, so we may believe that in v. 56 the present πατρός is due to a supposed contraction παρος in an earlier copy, justifying Earle's conjecture πάρος | νέμει. Certainly Earle is right in making Hyllus the logical subject of δοκεῖν, and his conjecture is easier than Nauck's νέμειν νῦν —δοκεῖς (not mentioned by Jebb), which also relieves the difficulty that many have felt with δοκεῖν. The 'father's' 'reputation of being successful' (Jebb) has nothing to do with the case.

One of the most commendable characteristics of this series is its strong defence of the traditional text. The most conservative will rarely have to object to the reception of a conjecture where the MSS. reading can be retained. Yet I venture to defend the tradition in two passages. In 422, τίς πόθεν μολὼν | σοὶ μαρτυρήσει ταῦτ' ἐμοὶ κλύειν παρών; Jebb accepts Bothe's πάρα for παρών. But there is much force in παρών here. It is a defiant challenge on the part of Lichas for a direct witness to his words. His defiance turns to scorn when the Messenger answers only the first question, ποῖος ἐν ἀνθρώποισι; He is quick to take advantage of the apparent evasion of the second question, sneers at the δόκησις on which he thinks that the Messenger depends, and in a distinct tone of triumph asks Deianeira who this fellow is. The Messenger's next words however, ὅς σοὶ παρών ἤκουσεν, completely shatter his self-confidence. The second παρών wins greatly in force by reason of the former, while πάρα would be distinctly weak. The change in 675 of ἔχριον ἀργῆτ' οἷς εἰδένον πόκω to ἔχριον, ἀργῆς.....πόκος is unnecessary. A presumption is raised in favour of the change by the groundless assertion that

ἀργῆτ' in the MSS. = ἀργῆτι. But there is no punctuation in L to indicate this. The objections to ἀργῆτα are merely that it would be weak in this position, and that 'the connection of ἀργῆς with πόκος is confirmed by Aesch. *Eum.* 45 ἀργῆτα μαλλόν.' It is 'confirmed' for πέπλον just as clearly by *Il. T.* 419 ἐανῶ ἀργῆτι φαιενῶ (Apitz). An epithet is needed for πέπλον rather than for πόκω, and the rhythm favours the connexion of ἀργῆτ' with what precedes. This view is wrongly attributed to Nauck, who has merely placed a comma after the adjective as Wunder did before it. Neue, Apitz, and Wunder-Wecklein hold to the same interpretation without the comma.

In 1160, πρὸς τῶν πνεόντων μηδενὸς θανεῖν ἵπο, Professor Jebb accepts Erfurt's τῶν ἐμπνεόντων. But the objection to θανεῖν after ἦν πρόφαντον still remains, though not mentioned. Sophocles always uses the future, I believe (cf. *Trach.* 79, 825, 1171, etc.), and the aorist in other authors is exceptional. *O. T.* 713, quoted by Blaydes, is not a case in point. Wecklein's χρῆναι θανεῖν meets the difficulty, but is too violent. Would not τελεῖν βίον be the simplest remedy (cf. *Ant.* 1114 τὸν βίον τελεῖν)? ἵπο having effected an entrance as a gloss on πρὸς, τελεῖν was replaced by the self-evident θανεῖν. πνεόντων = ζώντων is not seriously objectionable, and could hardly have replaced ἐμπνεόντων.

In so conservative a text it is to be expected that many scholars will find the defence of the tradition occasionally inadequate. Indeed in many instances, though the critical notes are crowded with conjectures, one finds in the commentary no hint that the passage in question is in any way unusual. The reader feels that, in an edition so strong on the side of interpretation, he has a right to expect at least the editor's opinion on the difficulties that other great scholars have felt. The defence of χώρουσιν αὐτοῦ 145, of ὥσπερ εἶδετε 692, and of ἡνύσω 995, is not convincing. The objections to ἡνύσω are (1) voice and (2) metre. Nothing is said of the latter. The comment on the former is this: 'The proper force of the middle "to obtain," "win" seems fitting here, since the sacrificial altars may be said to have earned the recompense given by Zeus.' But ἐπί μοι is quite overlooked (cf. translation 'won for me'), as well as the fact that the middle must mean 'win for oneself,' as it does in the passage cited, *Ar. Phut.* 196. Wakefield's ἡνυσας (cf. *Phil.* 710, 1145) seems necessary. So also Herwerden's ὦπερ

in 692. In 144 f. I cannot see how τοιοῖσδε can refer to τῶν δ' ἀπειρος εἰ. The reference to Ai. 148 is *against* it, because τοιοῖσδε λόγους there has a direct antecedent in θόρυβοι. Since the difficulty in this passage lies entirely in τοιοῖσδε and αὐτοῦ, the citation from Antiphon, which gives καὶ αὐτό, cannot be said to 'confirm' the MSS. καὶ νῦν. In the commentary on 1048 f., the editor does not recognize the difficulty of κοῦπω following μοχθήσας ἐγώ, for which Wunder suggested οὔπω (also not mentioned). But, as the translation, 'Ah, fierce..... have been the labours of these hands! But no toil' etc., shows, we should have a finite verb in the first clause or simply οὔπω following. The καί, however, is strong, as Jebb makes clear on *Ant.* 332, and ought to stand. The simplest correction would be ἐχω for ἐγώ—an easy change considering the similarity in sound and in writing of the two words.

Of the two conjectures of his own which the editor admits to the text, the first, λυτήριον <λώφημα> 554 for λύπημα is the best that has yet been proposed. Not so with ἐτοίμα for ὄμμα in 1019, because (1) ῥώμα is not readily understood from κατ' ἐμὴν ῥώμαν preceding, (2) ἐς πλεόν ἢ δι' ἐμοῦ σῶζειν can hardly mean 'too largely to need my aid in his relief,' (3) the old man simply asks Hyllus to *help* (σύλλαβε). In the analysis of the various conjectures in the Appendix, Gleditsch's <τάδε> γὰρ οἶμαι ἂν πλεόν ἢ δίχα σοῦ σωκεῖν (οἶμαι and κἂν πλεόν had been suggested by M. Schmidt, δίχα σοῦ σωκεῖν by Meineke) is not mentioned. This gives very nearly the sense required. I cannot but think, however, that ἢ δι' ἐμοῦ σῶζειν (or σωκεῖν) is right, and, as Jebb says, ἐς πλεόν is a certain correction of the MSS. ἐμπλεον. The sense clearly is, 'Help me, for with your aid to a greater extent than by myself' etc. Would not the following reading satisfy both sense and grammar without too great violence? σὺ δὲ σύλλαβε, σὺν γὰρ ἂν οἶμαι ἐς πλεόν ἢ δι' ἐμοῦ σῶζειν (or σωκεῖν). After the corruption of οἶμαι to ὄμμα, σὺν was naturally changed to σοί, and ἂν gave way to the space-filler τε. For the position of ἂν see Jebb's note on *Ant.* 466.

ἀγὼν δὲ μαργᾶ for ἐγὼ δὲ μάτηρ in 526 is more violent than Wecklein's ἐγὼ δὲ μὴν τέρματ' οἷα φράζω, and not so suitable to the sense, of course with the change of ἐλευνὸν to τὸ δεινὸν—an essential part of Wecklein's conjecture that Jebb fails to record. Thus we win a contrast between the result of the fight, which was favourable to Deianeira, and her fearful expectation of the unfavour-

able alternative. μαργᾶ with ἀγὼν in the sense 'the battle rages' strikes one as modern. In 869 Jebb objects rightly to the commonly accepted ἀρῆς for ἀήθης, proposing instead ἀγρῆς. The much better suggestion of Blaydes, κατηφῆς, is not even mentioned, though made extremely probable by Machlin, who proposed it, independently of Blaydes, on the strength of Choricus Gazaeus 103 (ed. Boissonade) τίς οὖν οὕτω κατηφῆς καὶ συνωφρυνόμενος ὃν οὐ καταθέλει τὰ δρώμενα; Occurring as it does in a writer who shows much familiarity with the classical poets, this certainly looks like an echo of our passage. The objection to ἐπ' ἄλλοις for ἀπαιδὸς in 911 is that Deianeira had no prophetic gift to know that Hyllus was not to succeed to his father's position as head of the household. The corrections made in 853 are decidedly good, giving the metrically correct ἀναρσίῳν <ἔπ'> οὔπω <τοῦδ' σῶμ'> ἀγκλειτόν, and explaining the source of the error. ἐς πόλιν for στόλον in 562 and ὁ γὰρ ποθὼν for τὸ γὰρ ποθοῖν in 196 are both good, better than σπόδιον for σπιλάδος in 678, which allows the objectionable ψῆ to stand.

I have had occasion above to notice the omission by the editor of essential parts of other scholars' conjectures. In 380 Wecklein's conjecture for μὲν οὔσα γένεσιν is not γεγῶσα but γεγῶσ' ἀνακτος, and in 582—7 he not only makes the changes mentioned, but also reads πεπείραμαι for πεπείρανται, which he believes to be wrong. Wunder's conjecture in 331 is ἐξ ἐμοῦ νείαν. ἐμὴν for ἐμᾶς is essential to Blaydes' κἂν κοινοῦσθαι 396, and in 1012 he proposes πολλὰ μάλ' for πολλὰ μὲν (not for πάντα), or κατὰ δὲ δρία πολλὰ for κ. τε δ. πάντα. Similar omissions are found in critical notes on 94, 267, 581, 825, 743, App. on 911 (Nauck prefers Reiske's ἐστίας to go with his ἀπάτορας). Nauck's conjecture in 969 is ὄντ' (not ὄντα) and his change in the corresponding verse 960 should be given. Instead of Wecklein's abandoned πρόσφατον γ' ἐμοῦ λάβοι in 331 his latest reading τοῖς οὔσιν ἤδη πρόσφατον λύπην λάβοι would have been more acceptable.

The following conjectures are wrongly accredited: 328 αὐτῆς (omitting γ') Wecklein after Blaydes, 692 Herwerden before Blaydes, 810 ἐπεί τοι Axt, 873 κανὼν οἰκοθεν M. Schmidt before Mekler, 878 ἐλέθρον Herwerden before Blaydes, 1014 οἶδεν ὀρέξει Gleditsch on the basis of Fröhlich's ὀρέξαι; 1238 φθίνοντος ὄραν in Nauck's reading was suggested by Blaydes.

The following emendations admitted to

the text are not accredited to their authors; 210 *παῖνα παῖν'*, 539 *ἐπὶ*, 557 *παρὰ*, 772 *βόρσι*, and 1073 *προσγίγνεται*, Bruck; 68 *ἰδρῶσθαι*, 332 *ἀντίπαρρα*, and 1084 *διαβόρος*, Dindorf; 97 *καρῦξαι*, 1082 *ἀρτίως ὅδ' αὖ*, and 1044 and 1046 *ἔστι*, Hermann; 445 *τ' ἀνδρὶ*, Seidler. We should be sorry to see Professor Jebb give up the practice, followed in the earlier volumes of the series, of noting the originators of these little corrections, even though they are now universally accepted.

We miss from the critical notes many of the conjectures that are currently reported. For this we are grateful, for in general we may justly infer that Professor Jebb has weighed them and found them wanting to such an extent that it would have been a waste of valuable space to mention them. We could cheerfully have spared many that have gained admission. But there are many others, not only supported by great names, but sometimes also by intrinsic probability, for which we look in vain. Such are Wunder's *τοῦδε* 17, Metzger's *τάλαυαν* 139, Braun's change of order in 308—311, of which Nauck and Herwerden approve, Hilberg's *εἰπέ, τοῦ σπορά ποτ' ἦν* 316, Hense's *ἑμὴν γυναῖκες* 673 and *γόνος* 1205. I think that no notice has been taken of two valuable works that have appeared within the last few years, Herwerden's *Lucubrationes Sophocleae* and Gleditsch's *Cantica der Sophokleischen Tragödien*. At any rate the following attractive conjectures, if they cannot all be called emendations, are not mentioned: Herwerden, transposition of *μάχης* and *πόνων* in 20 and 21 and of *ποτὲ* and *παρὰ* in 555 and 557, 87 *πάλαυ γ' ἀπῆ*, 623 *ἑρείς*, 682 *οὐδέν'* (note disagreement between Jebb's note on this verse and that on *Ph.* 24 to which he refers), 955 *ἐκποδὸν* or *ἐκτόπιον*, 1058 *δαῖος*, 1211 *πον*; Gleditsch, 129 noticed above, 646 *ἐπ' οἴκου*, 890 *τίς* for *πῶς*, 949 and 952 *δύσποτμον* and *μένειν*, 1012 *πήματ' ἀναιρῶν* (suggesting Wecklein's *κνώδαλ' ἀναιρῶν*), 1027 *δαῖνα*, and many others in the melic parts that deserve consideration.

We could wish that the reasons advanced by the best critics for rejecting certain verses might have received more attention in the commentary. Sometimes the objections are so stated that they appear quite trivial. On 695 ff. we read: 'Wunder rashly rejects the verse. Dobree's objection to it seems to have been the repeated *ἐς*.' Then follow illustrations of the repeated preposition. But even supposing that Dobree could have found so simple a grammatical construction objectionable, is it quite fair

to allow the reader to infer that Wunder, Dindorf, Blaydes, Nauck, Wecklein, Subkoff and others have had no better reason for emending or rejecting the verse? See also on vv. 24, 301, 305. The interesting 'black-list' of suspected verses on p. liii, which is given as 'nearly complete,' might be increased by the following, omitting the wholesale rejections of such scholars as Schmelzer. 31—33 Blaydes, 57 f. reduced to one by Hense; 54 f. reduced to one by Nauck; 90 f. Hermann; 167 Wunder; 260—280 Blaydes; 274 f. reduced to one by Hense; 308 f. Herwerden; 313 Wunder; 351 Opitz; 379—81 reduced to one by Hense; 383 f. Herwerden; 447 Blaydes; 672 f. reduced to one by Nauck; 678 Herwerden; 731 f. reduced to one by Nauck; 898 f. Herwerden and Nauck; 1105 Campe; 1266—7 reduced to one by Nauck; 1225—27 H. F. Müller. In this list 735 should be 745, and 1060, 1069. If the names of the important editors who agree with the first critic were given, the list would be more valuable to the student. That Professor Jebb finds it necessary to reject only three out of this large list of about 150 bad verses speaks volumes for English scholarship.

In the commentary we note a loose use of the 'accusative of respect' on v. 137 (the example from Isocrates gives a *direct object* followed by an appositive clause), 350 (*ἀ* is direct obj., *ἀγνοία μ' ἔχει* = *ἀγνοῶ*, cf. Jebb's note on *O.C.* 223, 583, 1119), 608 (*τι* is to be explained by the preceding question *τί δ' ἔστι*), 914 and 941 (acc. retained in passive, correctly explained on 158). *ἐξῆλθον ἀεθλ'* is not satisfactorily explained by the passages given on 159. The citations on 1204 f. are not in point. It is not a question of adoption into another family, but of disowning. The examples given on 1241 for the use of *φράζω* might be cited to prove the contrary, that *χειρὶ* was necessary to give the word a figurative instead of its literal meaning. I mention these three notes because others have found a change in the text necessary. The new interpretation offered of *λιθοκόλλητον στόμιον* 1261, 'a curb on lips set like stone to stone,' seems impossible. If the reading is correct the first interpretation suggested is the best, 'a curb set with sharp stones.' A curb is wanted, not to hold the lips together, but to give the sufferer something to hold between his teeth that he may better endure the pain, on the principle of a bullet in the mouth of a patient at a surgical operation. The more painful the curb the less the sense of pain elsewhere.

I have noticed a few misprints. In the text, 551 καλῆται, 611 comma misplaced, 996 μ' ἀρ'; in the critical notes, 331 πρόσφατον γ', 632 κἀκεῖθεν, 882 'Wunder wrote' etc. belongs to preceding verse, 964 βάσις; in the commentary, 80 f. ὕστερον, 83—85 εἴ τις, 149 f. ἐν, 679 λόγον, 801 read '1st. pers. sing.', 898 ποῖν, 947 transposition necessary, 1238 ὥς; in Appendix, p. 207, l. 18, insert 'not' before 'to Hyllus.' In

critical note on 1183, 'Blaydes ἀρεῖς, which Nauck and Mekler cite without noticing the ᾗ, the editor is the guilty one. ἀρῶ from ἀείρω has ā; cf. Pers. ἀροῦμεν στόλον and Ran. 377. A similar confusion occurs in the index to the *Antigone*, where under αἶρω is given a reference to the usage of ἀείρω.

EDWARD CAPPS.

University of Chicago.

ERHARDT ON THE HOMERIC QUESTION.

Die Entstehung der Homerischen Gedichte. Von LOUIS ERHARDT. Leipzig, Duncker und Humblot. 1894. Pp. cxiii. 546. M. 12.

Dr. ERHARDT is certainly a bold man. He believes himself to have found the final solution of the Homeric question: and what is more, he seems to expect to convert every one to his view. It is a pity that he should not have started with more moderate assertions and hopes: for his book contains much that is interesting and able, and in many points advances the question with which it deals; but excessive claims serve only to rouse suspicion and distrust.

The key which has unlocked to Erhardt the great mystery is a right conception of the Volksepos—a conception which, as he seems to think, has not been attained by any of the professed Homerists, with the single exception of Niese, and even in his case only with an admixture of error which makes the two theories, though in essence very similar, seem the very opposites of one another. Dr. Erhardt began his Homeric studies as a historian, not as a philologist: and though he has thus been enabled to attack the problem with a notable freshness of view, which renders his work excellent reading, he has perhaps had to pay the penalty in an imperfect acquaintance with recent work. So far as can be told from his book, he knows nothing of anything later than Niese and Christ.

In fact his theory is anything but revolutionary; it is in essence accepted, I believe, by most recent workers; if I may speak for myself, it is precisely the general conception of the rise of the *Iliad* which I have long held. That the creative power of the Epos is the poetical genius of an epoch; that the epic poets are the mouthpieces of their age, not individual and isolated per-

sons of quite phenomenal genius; that the *Iliad* grew by successive accretion, each new motive affecting what went before and producing anticipative as well as subsequent changes; that an original *Iliad* is not to be discovered by mere athetesis, and that what is called interpolation in our texts is in almost every case only a part of a continuous creative process; all these theses can surely be regarded now almost as commonplaces of criticism. And the 'theory of the Volksepos' does not seem to contain more than this. It is true that Erhardt makes a point of eliminating the diaskeuast from the poem, but then the diaskeuast, as Lachmann conceived him, had, one thought, long disappeared: and the diaskeuast as he still exists, the mechanical inventor of a few lines here and there to connect portions of narrative, is virtually admitted (e.g. in H and P) even by Erhardt. He holds too that the Volksepos itself may be, and probably is, the work of a 'Sängerschule,' as many of us have all along been supposing that it was; so that in our fundamental conceptions it does not seem that Erhardt has brought us much farther forward.

And this suspicion is strengthened when we come to weigh the results to which the new key leads us. Erhardt is led to the discovery that the oldest part of the *Iliad* (p. 505) consists of 'the Wrath (our A), then the unsuccessful fighting of the Greeks in the absence of Achilles (parts of A-O), the sending of Patroklos and his death (Π), the return of Achilles to battle and the slaying of Hector (Y-X). To these was added a series of further songs, which partly branched off from the main action, partly served to complete it' (the Presbeia, the Agora in B, the making of the arms in Σ, the deceiving of Zeus in Ξ-O, the parting of Hector and Andromache in Ζ, the duels between Paris

and Menelaos, Aias and Hector, the aristeia of Diomedes and of Idomeneus, the Doloneia, the games in Ψ and the ransoming of Hector). All this I can of course only applaud with all my heart, for these views entirely coincide with my own.

But now we come to a serious point of difference. Erhardt holds that these separate songs were all tolerably independent of one another, though treating their matter under the general unity of the Wrath. That is, it would seem, that though the earlier singers of the Volksepos had a story which dealt (1) with the wrath of Achilles; (2) with the consequent discomfiture of the Greeks; (3) with the consequent sending and death of Patroklos; (4) with the consequent return of Achilles to battle and the death of Hector; yet these four different portions of the story were never combined till much later in a consecutive narrative at all, but went on more or less independently side by side. This is to me a most extraordinary idea. The whole story is there, yet the little links to bind it together are denied. Why the Volksepos should not be able to create a unity of some 2,000 lines, when it could admit unities of 600, is beyond my apprehension. And in fact we have in our existing *Iliad*, as I believe myself to have shown, the very links which are needed, save only between (3) and (4). The agreement between the four portions of the story, when carefully analysed, is complete: so complete as to preclude the possibility of even a modified independence, and I cannot see that Erhardt has done anything to disprove this agreement.

With regard to some of the later rhapsodies the case is somewhat different, and I am not concerned to deny that, before they were incorporated with the *Iliad*, such portions as the Presbeia, and still more the Doloneia, may have had a more or less independent existence: that is, they were composed with a general reference to the plot of the *Iliad*, without fitting exactly into any place in it. A similar assumption must be made too in the case of the Agora in B and of books N-O, which seem to show clear evidence of the fusion of elements originally alternative to one another. But with regard to the bulk of the accretions it seems not only most probable, but most consistent with the conception of the Volksepos as laid down by Erhardt himself, to suppose that they were originally designed for incorporation, and in fact were originally incorporated, with the *Iliad* as it was from time to time, always a corpus ready to receive fresh additions. And

in all that Erhardt has said I can find no valid evidence against this view.

Hence it becomes impossible to accept Erhardt's 'second period of the Epos,' 'in which the need of a more systematic arrangement of the lays in a distinct succession made itself felt.' No reason is given why such an obvious need was not felt from the very first. In fact Erhardt here all but falls into sheer Lachmannism, and what he says is open to the objections which have been so successfully urged against the Kleinliedertheorie. However ingeniously he may try to avoid it, the work he assigns to this period is in fact no better than the task of the diaskeuast, whom he claims to dispense with; and the difficulty is acute when he comes to Peisistratos, whose collection of the lays of the *Iliad* he expressly believes in, and in fact describes as the third period of the Epos. The task of Peisistratos, he says, was the 'collecting and writing down of what already existed, not arrangement and redaction.' As for the writing down, that may of course have been left to Peisistratos, though it seems unlikely; but what possible room is there for 'collecting' when the corpus, with all its little connecting links, has already been formed? It is at least conceivable that individual lays may have existed in a more or less independent form till then: but with the links this is absurd. Their presence is unanswerable evidence that all the collecting had already been done. If the *Iliad* was not complete as we have it before the time of Peisistratos, then his work, if work he did, must have been redactional; if the *Iliad* already existed in its present form, then Peisistratos did not collect it.

It is unfortunate that Erhardt should have laid his work open to these fundamental objections in a part of the theory which is rather a hindrance than a help to his view of the Volksepos—a view which I have no doubt is in the main perfectly right, and which he has on the whole put better, perhaps, than any of his predecessors. It looks as though he had not succeeded in freeing himself from the traditional reverence which the name of Lachmann seems still to carry with it in Germany. He has done such good work that he might very easily have done better. In detail of course there is much in which it is impossible to agree with him; much rests, as in this matter it must always rest, on individual judgment. But there is much too in which he has made advances on what has been done before. His analysis, for instance, of

the Theomachy in Y-Φ, and of the steps by which those two books have attained their present form, seems to me excellent; it is only a pity that he should not have applied the principle of gradual growth, which he uses so skilfully for these two books, to the *Iliad* as a whole, without recourse to his machinery of second and third periods. He has made another excellent suggestion too in H; that the Agora of the Trojans, with the proposal to surrender Helen, originally followed the duel in Γ, before the invention of the Pandaros episode as its conclusion; and that this proposal is what Paris refers to, when in Z he speaks of anger against the Trojans as the reason why he will not take the field. The idea is one which throws light on many difficulties, and can hardly fail to be right. On the other hand his analysis of II is very unsatisfactory. He has not a word to say about the glaring signs of dislocation which occur in this book wherever the wall is mentioned, and which form one of the most instructive handles for the criticism of the *Iliad*. And the question of the change of armour is certainly not to be dismissed in the few words which he

devotes to it in a note. In fact his view of this most important book does not seem to be at all consistent. In his summary already quoted, he distinctly, and undoubtedly with justice, puts it down as one of the oldest constituents of the *Iliad*, to which the Hoplopoia in Σ was subsequently added. Yet in the analysis itself he says that the Hoplopoia 'to all appearance belongs to the old portions of the poems, and to an epic period beyond which it is not in our power to see'; and seems to regard II as in all essentials assuming the existence of Σ.

For these and other reasons, which there is no space to enter into here, the book is most disappointingly unequal. The author is so enthusiastic and hopeful, so ingenious and acute, his style is so delightfully lucid, his views are often so fresh, that one would be only too glad to give his book unmixed approval. It is certainly one to be read and weighed by all students; but it is far indeed from bringing the problem to the 'endgültigen Abschluss' which it promises.

WALTER LEAF.

EXTENDED AND REMOTE DELIBERATIVES.

'Extended' and 'Remote' Deliberatives in Greek. By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE, Professor of Latin in the University of Chicago. (Extracted from the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. Vol. xxiv. 1893.)

ALL who are interested in syntactical questions will welcome the above-mentioned brochure for the light it throws on two subtle points of Greek syntax, which have already been debated in the pages of this *Review*. The author sets himself to solve the twofold question: Did the Greek language possess a final relative subjunctive and a remote deliberative optative? Both questions are answered in the negative, and if all scholars will not share his conclusions they cannot henceforth overlook his arguments.

Part I. of the extracts before us is taken up with the subjunctive idiom. After giving a brief outline of all that has been hitherto written on the subject, the author proceeds to state the rival theory of the extended deliberative and defends his position as follows.

1. The introductory expressions after which the so-called 'final relative with subjunctive' is found are all of a type usually followed by the deliberative clause. They convey the notion either of the existence of a difficulty or its absence (presence of means); in other words they contain an affirmation or negation of that state of perplexity which generally postulates a deliberative subjunctive.

2. The historical order of their appearance favours a deliberative origin. All the earlier examples, down to the last of those cited from Xenophon, are found to express 'existence of a difficulty,' while it is in the later ones that 'existence of means' occurs. This fact points to the development of the latter class from the former—a state of things which should be reversed, were the 'final subjunctive' theory correct.

3. The case for the deliberative is strengthened by the absence of *āv* in all the disputed examples of Attic sources. The final relative with subjunctive is, in Homer, almost invariably accompanied by that particle, the solitary exceptions being Γ 459 and σ 334.

Now, on the hypothesis that our instances are descended from the Homeric idiom, the invariable absence of *ἀν* would be inexplicable, whereas on the deliberative theory it is only what we should expect.

Prof. Hale next seeks to corroborate his views from a similar idiom said to be found in Anglo-Saxon, as well as from an 'extended deliberative future indicative' of which we now hear for the first time.

Of the twenty-five examples which form the subject of the inquiry just summed up, five are introduced by *οὐκ ἔχω* and five by *ἔχω*—both used intransitively; five others have *οὐκ ἔχω* followed by an accusative of direct object, being of the form *οὐκ ἔχω πρόφασιν*, *οὐδένα ἔχω*. Of the remaining ten *οὐκ ἔστι*, with or without a predicate, is the introductory expression to five; the rest are too heterogeneous to admit of classification.

To the present writer it would seem that two of the latter five ought to be eliminated from a list of 'extended' deliberatives:

οὐ γὰρ ἄλλον οἶδ' ὅτω λέγω. Soph. Phil. 938.
οὐ πρόφασιν ἀπορῶ δι' ἣντινα λέγω. Isocr. 21, 1.

These should be regarded as deliberatives proper, as the prolepsis or antipthesis in *προφάσεως* and *ἄλλον* offers no difficulty. Otherwise they possess all the marks of strict deliberatives. As regards the others Prof. Hale has abundantly proved that all those in which a subjunctive occurs must be set down as being deliberative in origin. A doubt may however be raised about some in which an optative is used, e.g.

οὐδένα γὰρ εἶχον ὅστις...πέμψει. Eur. I. T. 588.

ὄρῶντα μὲν...ἄνδρα δ' οὐδέν' ἔντοπον οὐχ ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν... Soph. Phil. 279.
οὐκ ἔχων...οὐδέ τιν' ἐγγύρων...ὅς κατευνάσειεν. Ib. 691.

No one can deny that (after a primary tense) nothing would be more natural than *οὐδέν' ἔχω ὅστις πέμψει*. It is further well known that the future indicative is retained in this construction after a historic tense. Moreover if there be any deviation from this rule we should expect to find a future optative. Nevertheless it has yet to be proved that the foregoing examples are not cases of final relative with anomalous sequence. When it is remembered that the optative is the mood of secondary sequence in most dependent clauses, the step here

involved is quite intelligible. It is not certain that we do not possess instances of the kind, as may be seen from the two following parallel passages:

ἀλλ' ἄρον ἔξω καὶ μάλιστα μὲν μέθης ἐνταῦθ' ὅπου με μὴ τις ὄψεται βροτῶν. Trach. 801.
κρύψας' εἰαυτὴν ἐνθα μὴ τις εἰσίδει. Ib. 905.

This view however loses much of its probability from the fact that *εἰσίδει* is more likely due to implied oratio obliqua (where, as she thought, none would see). Confirmation of this is found in another verse, also from Sophocles: *ἔφηνγον ἐνθα μήποτ' ὀψόμεν.* O. T. 796. Here the context points forcibly to indirect discourse as the true explanation of the optative. Hence, even in instances to which I have taken exception, the balance of probability favours the deliberative. It must not be lost sight of that Prof. Hale does not consider the optatives cited above as instances of an indirect *remote* deliberative. An indirect *remote* deliberative would necessitate recourse to a *direct* remote deliberative; but Prof. Hale, as well as Prof. Jebb, seeks the direct form of *ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν* in *τίς ἀρκέσῃ*; not in *τίς ἀρκέσειε* which would be the direct remote deliberative.¹

Prof. Hale is not so felicitous in his discovery of an 'extended' deliberative future indicative. Samples of the latter are:

οὐδ' ἐνι | φροντίδος ἔγχος | ᾧ τις ἀλέξεται. O. T. 169.

οὐ γὰρ τις ὄρμος ἔστιν, οὐδ' ὅποι πλέων ἐξεμπολήσει κέρδος ἢ ξενώσεται. Soph. Phil. 302.

¹ I may perhaps be permitted to append here the arguments which, in my opinion, militate against regarding *κρύψας' εἰαυτὴν ἐνθα μὴ τις εἰσίδει* as a certain instance of virtual Or. Obl.

1. If this were an incontestable case of quoted statement—to the exclusion of other influences—it should admit of being rendered: 'Where, as she thought, none saw.' Compare Plato *Rep.* 614 B *ἀναβιούς δ' ἔλεγετο ἂ ἐκεῖ ἴδου*—'which, as he alleged, he saw'; cf. also Soph. O. T. 1246 and Pind. *Ol.* 6, 49. The direct thought or utterance would have contained *εἰσείδε* or *εἰσεώρα* or *εἰσορᾷ* or *εἰσώσεται*. If either of the three former, we should have a genuine case of virtual Or. Obl., but the consequent rendering would not suit the context; if the latter, we are on debateable ground, as the question of sequence offers a difficulty whether the relative clause expresses a statement of fact or of purpose.

2. The English rendering: 'Where, as she thought, none would see,' is ambiguous and may be but a mere paraphrase of the ordinary final construction. It is one of our ways of expressing intention.

These possess all the characteristics of the final relative clause with the future indicative.¹ The meaning is admittedly final; the syntactical form is so likewise. In fact, practically speaking, the only element common to these and deliberative clauses is the introductory expression *οὐκ ἔστι*. But surely a final relative is equally admissible after *οὐκ ἔστι*. Is it not good Greek to say *οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις λύσεται*? Is the corresponding Latin, *non est consilii vis quo quis mederi queat*, to be regarded as of deliberative origin? The development of an 'extended' deliberative future indicative is of course possible, but even supposing it to exist, it could never with certainty be distinguished from the rival idiom exactly similar in form and meaning.

Prof. Hale's argument might be parodied in this way. Let us suppose the existence of a deliberative potential to be satisfactorily established and let us take as specimen of the same Soph. *Trach.* 991 *οὐκ ἔχω πῶς ἂν στέρξαιμι κακὸν λεύσσων*.

We now look out for an 'extension' of this idiom in the direction of purpose and we alight on the line *οὐδὲ μὴν ναὺς ἔστιν ἣ σωθείμην ἄν*. Eur. *Heracl.* 1047. This would be a case of 'extended' deliberative potential. Now the only difference between the line of argument here pursued and that leading to Prof. Hale's discovery, is the fact that the deliberative potential has so far not met with recognition from grammarians, whereas the deliberative future indicative is well warranted.

The remaining instance of this idiom may be readily explained without recourse to the principle of 'extension.' In the lines *αὐτὸν γὰρ δεῖ προμηθέως | ὅτω τρόπῳ τῇσδ' ἐκκυλισθήσει τύχης*, Aesch. *Prom.* 86, the phrase *δεῖ προμηθέως ὅτω τρόπῳ* is either equivalent to *δεῖ προμηθεύσθαι ὅπως* or to *δεῖ προμηθείας*.....In the latter case we should be dealing with a strictly deliberative clause or at least an indirect question; the former is a well-known construction.

One other example of those discussed in the treatise under review calls for comment:

*οὐκέτ' εἰσὶν ἐλπίδες
ὅποι τραπόμενος θάνατον Ἀργείων φύγω.*
Eur. *Or.* 722.

The expression *οὐκέτ' εἰσὶν ἐλπίδες*, if not containing a *verbum sentiendi*, has at least a verbal substantive *sentiendi*. Further the

¹ For present purposes it matters little whether we call them final or consecutive.

state of 'no hope' is certainly not far removed from a state of perplexity.²

Moreover, as our author informs Mr. Earle, 'hopes do not exist in order that one may escape' and hence they should not be made to bear the strain of a final appendage, even of the 'extended' type.

Happily the defects just noted, if defects they be, do not in the least invalidate the main contention of the treatise, viz. the non-existence of that remarkable phenomenon—a 'Greek final relative with subjunctive.' This is a theory which Prof. Hale's acute and scholarly arguments have at last disposed of, at any rate as regards Attic Greek, although he has probably not said the last word on that portion of the subject which is an inroad on Homeric grammar.

Part II. contains a most searching study of the remote deliberative—a theory which has been widely accepted in this country.

Prof. Hale first deals with the bibliography of the subject, stating the views not only of authors of grammars but also of commentators on the classics and others. It is to be regretted he has omitted the name of Paley,³ who certainly deserves mention. The inquiry leads to the decisive rejection of Mr. Sidgwick's hypothesis, the proofs being the following:—

1. The idea of 'remoteness from the possible' put forward as the distinguishing characteristic and *raison d'être* of the remote deliberative

(a) is not outside the range of meaning assignable to the potential; (b) neither does it constitute, as is alleged, sufficient ground for differentiation between the (subjunctive) proximate and remote deliberative; (c) this idea is not actually found in all Mr. Sidgwick's examples.

2. On the other hand (a) the potential is not only *a priori* sufficient to convey this notion of 'wild impossibility,' but (b) passages are forthcoming—and that in great abundance—which correspond exactly to the disputed examples, save that the presence of *ἂν* leaves no room for doubt as to their potential character. A list of these is given

² Literally: 'no hopes remain as to whither I am to turn to escape.'

³ Paley discussed most of the mooted passages as they came before him in his commentary on the Attic Tragedians. To him the omission of *ἂν* in potential clauses seemed a matter of course, and he adheres to the MS. reading in many places where other critics insert *ἂν*, e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 535, 1346 (Paley's numbering), see also *Bacch.* 747. Cf. the indices to his Aeschylus and Euripides (vols. i. and ii.) under the word 'Optative.'

on page 192 and it alone is quite sufficient to settle the question.

3. An examination of the context of some of the alleged instances of remote deliberative favours the potential theory: e.g. Aesch. *Cho.* 593-4 where *φάσαι* is said to be potential and to act as a pointer to the 'grammatical affinities' of *τίς λέγει*. Similarly Eur. *Alc.* 48 and 52.

4. Mr. Sidgwick's objections are not insoluble, not even his query as to why the omission of *ἄν* should be confined just to the class of expressions introduced by *οὐκ ἔστι*. Prof. Hale replies that as regards the independent construction the omission of *ἄν* is far more frequent than Mr. Sidgwick would seem to allow. He cites Aesch. *Ag.* 1163, *Suppl.* 727, Eur. *Andr.* 929, *Hipp.* 1186.¹ It is however freely admitted to be somewhat curious that the representatives of the dependent construction should all be relative. After examination of a list of potential optatives taken at random from some lexicons the following solution is suggested: *ἄν* is the particle of contingency as opposed to bare possibility, and its omission seems to take place in cases where the latter idea alone is conveyed.²

¹ It might have been added that some of those retained by Paley have as good authority as those cited here, i.e. Aesch. *Ag.* 535 (Paley) 1346 (ditto), Eur. *Bacch.* 747, *Helen.* 992, *Hipp.* 868 (Paley). Of course it is needless to add that instances occur in Homer, Pindar and Theocritus.

² Paley seems to have hit on the same explanation. On *Ag.* 603 he comments thus: 'The optative

It will be noticed that Prof. Hale directs his attack especially against the groundwork of Mr. Sidgwick's theory, namely, the distinction between the possible and remote from the possible. To the present writer such a division taken as a basis of syntactical forms seemed in the highest degree fantastical. In dealing with exclamations of persons in perplexity the context is generally sufficient to explain the nature of the situation, and the subjunctive idiom is quite capable of conveying even the most whimsical ideas, e.g. *ὑπὲρ ἀστέρας πέτωμαι*; Obviously the potential is likewise available to express either a maximum or a minimum of possibility. One hears, in fine, of no language possessing special forms for expressing different shades or different degrees of possibility. This was certainly a weak point in Mr. Sidgwick's armour.

It may be remarked in conclusion that, although unhesitatingly rejecting Mr. Sidgwick's addition to our syntactical tables, Prof. Hale does not claim more than a very strong probability for the potential theory. This reserve only renders his contribution towards the solution of the problem all the more valuable.

J. DONOVAN.

expresses a purely mental conception apart from any condition.' And on Eur. *Alc.* 52 he writes: 'It is a peculiarity of relative words to take the optative without *ἄν* in some cases where a merely contingent event is conceived.' By 'merely contingent' he means what Prof. Hale terms 'bare possibility.'

ALY'S ROMAN LITERATURE.

Geschichte der römischen Litteratur, von FRIEDRICH ALY. Berlin: 1894. R. Gärtner's Verlagsbuchhandlung. 8vo. pp. 356.

DR. ALY, who is favourably known by two little books on the life and writings of Cicero and of Horace, has prepared a brief history of Roman literature with a very definite purpose. His desire is to supplement the small portion of Latin literature which can be actually read in the upper classes of schools by such a sketch as may enable them to have some conception of it as a whole, and so to enter more completely into the intellectual life of the ancient world. Hence the book is not exactly one for the general reader, but still less is it one for the profes-

sional student. There are occasional hints as to the MSS. and the best editions, but on the whole there is little of the paraphernalia of learning. On the other hand there is a good deal of independence of judgment; and in particular there is some sharp criticism of Mommsen's literary judgments, which, to say the truth, are much more conspicuous for trenchancy and brilliance than for sobriety. There are fairly numerous quotations, with translations, by Dr. Bruno Kaiser, in the metres of the originals, in which may often be noticed a far from admirable spondee in the second half of the pentameter. The general plan and compass of the book seem well adapted to the purpose in view. The introduction contains some excellent remarks on the chief characteristics

of the Roman nation and the Latin language. The derivation of *carmen* and *Casmena* from *canere* in the chapter on the beginnings of Latin poetry is of course impossible. Without disparaging the work of Naevius, Dr. Aly entirely agrees with Lucian Müller's protest against Mommsen's depreciation of the character and poetry of Ennius, treating him as the true founder of Roman literature. It is worth notice by the way that he treats the famous line of Naevius as a Saturnian, reading *Fato Metelli Romae consules fiunt*; and that he does not follow the more recent fashion of accentuating Saturnians. He differs quite as widely from Mommsen's estimate of Plautus, and finds in him a genuine representative of the vigorous popular element in the drama, as Terence represents that of refined beauty. And he has some excellent remarks in qualification of Mommsen's general estimate of the New Comedy. He is equally at variance with Mommsen's praise of the *comoedia togata*, and with his defence of Caesar's action towards Laberius. In fact for the whole of the literature of the Republic Dr. Aly gives us a running protest against the views which the genius of the great historian has made fashionable at present. He is naturally most emphatic in his attack upon the 'thoroughly unscientific' account of Cicero, by which Mommsen has pandered to the vulgar popular prejudice, and has led even the sober Dr. Schanz to speak of him as a 'gefallene Grösse.' Dr. Aly's own sketch is excellent in its compressed but clear survey of his literary activity; but it would have been more convincing, if it had allowed a little more room for the shadows as well as the lights of his character and his genius.

Nothing is said which is inaccurate, but the effect of the whole is somewhat misleading. The same strong reaction leads the author to do less than justice to the charm of Caesar's prose: and he seems to forget that such simplicity and clearness are themselves signs of the highest art. To Catullus and Lucretius he does no more than justice; of Vergil he writes sympathetically, and fully recognizes his position as one of the first of 'reflective poets,' if not 'a naive genius,' a distinction which recurs with somewhat wearying frequency. The view taken is very much that of Ribbeck in his history of Latin poetry. To Sallust Dr. Aly does something more than justice; to Livy he is at least completely just. On the whole it may be fairly said that he gives a sober, accurate and kindly sketch of Latin literature, without anything of special value for English students, but well suited for the class of readers for whom it is intended. The literature of the decline is for the most part adequately treated, though such a notice as that of Cyprian is so brief as to be almost misleading. Due notice is taken of Mr. Hardy's interesting researches into the MSS. of Pliny, but the valuable evidence recently brought to light by Professor W. M. Ramsay as to Tacitus's proconsulship in Asia is ignored. Dr. Aly follows Ribbeck in treating Apuleius as the last of the Roman poets, though not without reference to Claudian and Namatianus; his survey of the prose writers he closes with Ammianus. His 350 pages are brightened for his German readers with many happy references to their native literature and especially to Goethe.

A. S. W.

TRUMBULL'S STUDIES IN ORIENTAL SOCIAL LIFE.

Studies in Oriental Social Life, and Gleams from the East on the Sacred Page. By H. CLAY TRUMBULL. Philadelphia, 1894.

GREECE was the source of Occidental culture, but many elements of Greek life can be explained best by comparison with Oriental customs. For instance, nothing in European modern life throws so much light upon the position of woman in Athens, and the relations of Athenians to their wives and the *hetaerae*, as the position of woman in Japan, and the readiness of the men of

Japan to turn to their wives for devotion and to the *geisha* girls for entertainment. Dr. Trumbull has gathered a mass of information and observations on Oriental betrothals and weddings, hospitality, funerals and mourning, prayers and praying. Illustrations may be drawn thence for many passages of Greek literature. Oriental customs of mourning allow us to supply details and parallels for the lamentations for Patroclus (Homer Σ 22 ff.) and for Hector (X 405 ff., Ω 710 ff.), and show the full significance of Homer γ 259 ff.,

where Nestor says of the fate of Aegisthus if Menelaus had found him alive: τὸν γε κύνες τε καὶ οἰωνοὶ κατέδαψαν, ... οὐδέ κέ τίς μιν κλαῦσεν Ἀχαιῶδων. The stories told of Oriental hospitality illustrate the feeling expressed by Orestes in Aesch. *Cho.* 554 ff.: ὥστ' ἐπεικάζειν τινὰ... καὶ τὰδ' ἐνέπειν τί δὴ πύλῃσι τὸν ἱκέτην ἀπείργεται Δίγισθος, εἰ περ οἶδεν ἐνδοῖμος παρών; and 637: εἰ περ φιλόξεν' ἐστίν. The author gives from the experience of Dr. L. Woolsey Bacon a striking parallel to the entertainment of Heracles by Admetus (Eur. *Alc.* 509 ff.), in spite of the latter's grief for Alcestis. He says that Koords ceased their wailing in order to avoid disturbing stranger guests: 'the privileges of mourning gave way to the demands of hospitality.' After reading the chapter on Oriental hospitality, one can no longer regard as a mere quibble the claim of Lycæon (Homer *Φ* 75 f.), that Achilles should not kill him since he had eaten food (though as

a prisoner) in the tent of the son of Peleus. The author notes many resemblances as well as contrasts between Oriental and Occidental usages, but does not make entirely clear his view of the connexion. Thus he speaks of the 'remarkable survival of these Oriental mourning customs... in the Irish wake,' and calls attention to the fact that the Irish cry of *ullagone* is 'identical in both sense and sound with the Arabic designation of the Oriental mourning cry,' without explaining the relation between the two.

But on the whole I do not know where else the classical scholar can find so conveniently gathered so much illustrative material on the subjects treated. The author, as may be gathered from the second title of the book, has collected also parallels to customs recorded in the Bible.

THOMAS DALE SEYMOUR.

Yale College.

PERSICHETTI ON THE VIA SALARIA.

Niccolo Persichetti. *Viaggio archeologico sulla Via Salaria nel circondario di Cittaducale.* Rome. 1893. Pp. 212.

THIS treatise is the fruit of a commission given to the author (the head of a noble family of Aquila) by the Minister of Public Instruction to explore the remains of the ancient *Via Salaria* between Rieti and the village of Tufo and between Antrodoco (*Interocrium*) and S. Vittorino (*Amiternum*), this latter portion being a branch of the main road which was continued to the coast at Giulianova (*Castrum Novum*). Between Rieti and Antrodoco and from there to S. Vittorino the line of route almost coincides with that of the modern railroad from Rieti to Aquila, which is only five miles from S. Vittorino. Travellers by it will remember the tremendous zigzags by which it climbs up from Antrodoco.

The date of the construction of the *Via Salaria* is unknown, but its name testifies to its antiquity, for with the exception of the *Via Latina* it is the only great Roman road which is not called after the censor or consul who constructed it. It is first mentioned by Livy under the year 361 B.C.; but probably at this date it only went as far as Rieti. The fact that *Forum Decii* lies about half-way between Rome and

Castrum Truentinum or *Truentum* would on the analogy of *Forum Appi*, *F. Aurelii* and *F. Flamini* seem to show that the road was continued to *Truentum* in the censorship of P. Decius Mus, B.C. 304. After leaving *Reate* it followed the course of the Velino (*Arens*), the first noteworthy place which it traversed being *Cutilia* or *Aquæ Cutiliae* celebrated for its three lakes, on one of which was the floating island known as the *Umbilicus Italiae*, and for its mineral waters, a too liberal use of which caused the death of the Emperor Vespasian. On the edge of one of these lakes Signor Persichetti came upon a piece of the old road about fifty feet in length, but he reports that other large pieces, which are noticed by Keppel Craven in his *Excursions in the Abruzzi*, have recently been destroyed. At *Cutilia* he found considerable remains of buildings, the most important being remains of *Thermae*. At *Interocrium*, six Roman miles from *Cutilia*, the road left the plain and ascended to cross the Apennines. At about four miles from *Interocrium*, immediately under Monte Terminillo (7,710 feet), which Signor Persichetti identifies with *Mons Tetricus*, the *Tetricae horrentes rupes* of Virgil, the real difficulties of the road began. For the next five miles there is ample testimony to the engineering powers of the Romans, the

most striking features being the galleries or tunnels through the rock, of which the longest is 200 yards in length, and the huge supporting walls which carry the road, sometimes far above the stream, sometimes below it, now on one side of it, now on the other, wherever the ground offered least difficulty. All this is well described by Signor Persichetti, and his remarks are illustrated by several photogravures. It was in this part of the road that he had the good fortune to discover an unknown milestone *in situ*. It is the sixty-ninth from Rome and bears an inscription of the year B.C. 16.

At about nine miles from Antrodoco the difficulties ceased, and the road emerged on the broad upper valley of the Velino. Two and a half miles further lies Bacugno, which Signor Persichetti identifies as the site of *Forum Decii*, placed by Kiepert at S. Croce, nearly two miles distant. The name and some incorrect information as to the provenance of an inscription has led previous authorities to place here the well-known *Fanum Vacunae*; but Signor Persichetti shows that the true site of this place, which was a *vicus* as well as a temple, is to be found nearer Antrodoco, at a small village called Laculo, situated at a considerable height above the road. At *Falacrine*, the birth-place of the Emperor Vespasian, marked by some remains near the village of Collicelli, the road made the final ascent to the watershed, and after crossing it at a height of about 3,500 feet above the sea, descended into the valley of the Tronto (*Iruentus*). The next station on the Antonine Itinerary is *Vicus Badies*, twelve miles from *Falacrine*. Four miles further on the road reached the village of Tufo, the limit of Signor Persi-

chetti's researches, which he plausibly identifies with the station *Ad Martis* mentioned in the Peutinger Table.

Of that part of the *Via Salaria* which led from *Interocrium* to *Amiternum* there are few visible remains. It first traversed the gorge, three miles in length, known as the Fosso di Rapello, which has more than once played a part in military annals. After ascending about 830 feet it emerged on one of the high plains so characteristic of Apennine scenery. This one is about $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles long; it terminates at Vigliana, the site of the ancient *Fisternae*. A little before Vigliana the watershed (3,300 feet) between the Velino and the Aterno is marked by the railway station of Sella di Corno. The next place on the route is Civita-Tommassa (*Foruli*), whence the road proceeded in a bee-line to S. Vittorino (*Amiternum*). This latter part of its course, about which there was some doubt, has been clearly elucidated by Signor Persichetti.

It should be noticed that in the first chapter, which deals with Roman roads in general, there are some inaccuracies. The distinction between the various classes of roads is not clearly brought out, and the statements on page 14 with regard to the officials who had the charge of the roads are incorrect. In the useful map at the end of the volume the milestone found at Antrodoco is by a slip marked as LXVII instead of LXIV. These however are trifling blemishes which do not detract from the real value of the work. It is a solid contribution to Italian archaeology and topography, and in particular to our knowledge of the Roman system of road-making.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

ROBINSON'S *PHILOCALIA OF ORIGEN*.

The Philocalia of Origen. The text revised with a critical introduction and indices: by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (Cambridge University Press, 1893. Pp. lii. 278.)

THIS edition will prove a welcome boon to all students of Theology or of Christian Literature. For the textual criticism of Origen and for that of the New Testament alike the recovery of the textual tradition of the *Philocalia* is of great importance.

But the work has even greater value as an end in itself, as providing the student with this excellent introduction to the study of Origen for the first time in a trustworthy text.

The edition of the *Philocalia* owes its origin to the former motive. Prof. Robinson had contemplated an edition of the *contra Celsum*, and had made considerable progress, in co-operation with Mr. Wallis, in sifting the MS. tradition of that work. But, owing largely to the advice of Dr. Hort, he was soon led to take in hand the *Philocalia*

MSS. as an indispensable preliminary of the other task. Then came the discovery that Dr. Koetschau was at work in the same field, also with a view to editing the *contra Celsum*. The two workers published their results independently, Mr. Robinson in the *Journal of Philology* 1889, Dr. Koetschau in *Texte und Untersuchungen* VI. i. From the latter scholar we may hope for a definitive text of the *contra Celsum*. Meanwhile we have in the book now under notice what may fairly be called a model of editorial work.

The introduction, dealing with the materials for the text, is lucidly clear, and the general results as bearing upon the *Philocalia* are given in a 'family tree' (p. xxvi. sq.). This differs slightly as to the grouping of some of its branches from that given by Koetschau. So far as it is possible to form a judgment without personal knowledge of the MSS., Mr. Robinson appears, in his summary of reasons, sufficiently to justify each step in his genealogical analysis. With regard to the MSS. of the *contra Celsum*, they all prove to be dependent on the one MS. Vat. Gr. 386; Koetschau, who in 1889 maintained the independence of Par. Suppl. Grec. 616, has now, it appears, come round to Prof. Robinson's view.

The most interesting subordinate question discussed (pp. xl.-xlix.) is the origin of *Philoc.* c. xxiv. which in Eusebius *Praep. Ev.*, whence Basil and Gregory drew it, is ascribed to an enigmatical 'Maximus.' The solution proposed for the puzzle,—that Basil and Gregory incorporated it because they knew it to occur in the Adamantian Dialogue, ascribed by them to Origen, but that the unknown author of the Dialogue took it in reality from a dialogue of Methodius where 'Maximus' was simply the interlocutor,—is made, to say the least, highly probable by Prof. Robinson.

Elaborate criticism of the text and indices is scarcely necessary in this notice. Both alike show every sign of scholarly care, and the misprints are singularly few: in fact I have only observed one, in the last word of p. 277.

The gratitude owed to the illustrious editors of the *Philocalia* by all who value a fearless and reverent constructive spirit in theology may also be extended to the conscientious accuracy by which their labour of love has now been recovered in something like its pristine form.

A. ROBERTSON.

THE MYSTERIES AND CHRISTIANITY.

Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum. Von LIC. GUSTAV ANRICH, Privatdozent in Strassburg. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1894. Pp. 237. Price 5s. 6d.

THIS volume supplies a want to which expression was given by Mr. Mayor at the close of the interesting discussion which took place a short time ago in the *Classical Review* regarding the origin of the Lord's Supper. It works out fully the relation of the ancient mysteries to early Christianity—a subject, it may be remembered, which was considered in some of its bearings in one of the unrevised Hibbert Lectures on the Hellenizing of Christianity by the late Dr. Hatch. As the result of a very full consideration of the whole subject the author comes to the conclusion that the general judgment of the ecclesiastical writers on the mysteries that formed the mainstay of falling paganism forbids the idea that

any conscious or direct acceptance of forms and institutions from the mystery-worship can have taken place. The final result of assimilation to the mysteries both of baptism and the Lord's Supper is very fully admitted; but the process is traced mainly to the magic of gnosticism—that attempt to express in symbolical and mythological form a combination of pagan, Jewish, and Christian ideas. The experiences, aims, and theories also of gnosticism, in which there was naturally inherent somewhat of the mysterious element, aided the process; and it was further promoted by the purifications, the magic, and the 'Telestik' of the Neo-Platonists and by the mystical tendency of later philosophy in which the religion of the time found its most distinct expression. Anything approaching to conscious imitation of the mysteries or designed borrowing from them—of deliberate accommodation to the religious language or modes of conception of paganism—Mr. Anrich

does not allow. 'We have here to do,' he says, 'with a natural, necessary, and therefore unconsciously effected process.' Hatch, it may be remembered, claimed no more than this; but he traced directly to the mysteries what Mr. Anrich shows good ground for considering as the result of a much wider and more complex range of phenomena. The earliest apostolic age is known to have been actuated by ideas very remote from those of the mysteries; and later on the conceptions of Christianity formed by St. Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel are in the main to be understood as no more than 'original creations of the Christian genius on the basis of genuine Judaism and to have been influenced only in a secondary degree by Greek thought.' The author finds no ground for tracing the views of St. Paul or St. John on baptism or the Lord's Supper to Greek influences. Pfeleiderer's connexion of the Pauline view of baptism with Eleusis is shown to be quite forced, the 'new birth' being nowhere mentioned as accompanying initiation, and the 'new name' of the hierophant being merely the official one of *ιερόνυμος*. The man's own name came back to him in the inscription on his tomb. The opinion of the mysteries entertained by Philo (*De Sacrificant.* p. 857 A)—a contemporary of St. Paul, a Jew, and a philosopher whose writings are steeped in the language of the mysteries—may also be allowed as a subsidiary proof that Eleusis is probably about the last place in the world which St. Paul would have sought to associate with a new Christian institution; although of course it will be readily allowed that the conception of the mysteries as set forth in the *Hymn to Demeter* or as practised by devout Greeks in the Periclean age is something very different from that associated by Philo with the practice of his time.

The process of the assimilation of the Christian sacraments to the mysteries is one that in the nature of things must have been slow and gradual, affecting as it did mainly the sphere of religious feeling and experience. The increasing degree to which

these were dominated by the mystic tendency of falling paganism may be explained by the fact that Christianity presented some points of contact to those tendencies. 'Christianity,' says Mr. Anrich, 'from its very origin was in some respects a knowledge concerned with revealed truths of faith, a side which was wanting to the popular religions of paganism, but has a sort of analogy in the revelations of the mysteries [but 'to the Eleusinians,' says Grote, 'the Homeric Hymn was genuine and sacred history'] and in the Neo-Pythagorean and the Neo-Platonic assumption of the divine revelation of the highest truths. Baptism and the Lord's Supper on the other hand were two sacred acts which appeared to the pagans as mysteries and must have awakened corresponding feelings and dispositions.' The spread of this view was largely favoured by the great Alexandrians, whose general conception of Christianity came to be a *γνώσις μυστηρίων*. The mysteries-terminology, too, was largely used by Christian writers because it yielded convenient forms of expression for cognate experience. It was widely spread, was consecrated by tradition, and had the additional advantage of being easily intelligible to antiquity. The points of contact, therefore, between the mysteries and Christianity rest upon no conscious borrowing from the mystery-system, but are a necessary consequence of the dominance of the idea of mystery in religious feeling. In his contribution to the *Essays and Reviews* Jowett thirty years ago recommended a lexilogus of theological terms as the great desideratum for the proper understanding of the New Testament. This method is applied in this volume to the mysteries-terminology with sound judgment and an adequate acquaintance with the pagan and Christian literature connected with the subject. There seems on the whole good ground for concluding that the Christian sacraments are neither 'pagan survivals' nor 'heathen beliefs baptized into Christ.'

J. HUTCHISON.

Glasgow.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

ΓΑΥΡΙΣ UND ΜΑΥΡΙΩΝ.

Am Schlusse seines Artikels über die Namen der griechischen Vasenmaler äussert sich de Witte (*Bullet. de Corresp. Hell.* 1878, S. 552) über die Inschrift ΓΑΥΡΙΣ ΕΠΟΕΞΕ oder ΜΕΠΟΕΞΕ, welche Postalaccas auf einer Pyxis in Athenischen Privatbesitz gelesen hatte (*Arch. Ztg.* 1876, S. 38), folgendermaassen: '... Cette lecture est douteuse, et je crois qu'il est prudent d'attendre des découvertes ultérieures, avant d'admettre le nom de *Gauris* dans la liste des fabricants de vases.' Diese Mahnung de Wittes zur Vorsicht ist nicht beachtet worden. Klein giebt in seinen *Meistersignaturen*², S. 213, den Namen *Gauris* ohne ein Fragezeichen an, und an einer andern Stelle desselben Buches (S. 10) nimmt er auf ihn Bezug und vermuthet dass er einer *Vasenmalerin* angehört habe.¹ Neuerdings hat P. Kretschmer (*Die Griech. Vasenschriften*, S. 74) dieser Auffassung widersprechen; den Namen an sich jedoch hält er für gesichert und reiht ihn unter die Vasenmalernamen mit fremdartigen oder wenigstens nicht-attischen Charakter ein.

Die angebliche Pyxis 'des' oder 'der' *Gauris* befindet sich gegenwärtig im K. Antikenkabinet zu *Kopenhagen*, wo ich sie im vorigen Jahre studiren und eine Abschrift der Inschrift nehmen durfte. Die Zweifel de Wittes erschienen mir vollständig berichtigt. Der erste Buchstabe des Namens ist nicht sicher ein Gamma: er hat die folgende Form Λ. Der von Postalaccas für ein Sigma gehaltene sechste Buchstabe ist sicher kein solches, sondern ein Omega (Ω). Von dem Reste des folgenden Buchstabens, welchen Postalaccas sah (Λ) und den de Witte zu Μ ergänzte (ΜΕΠΟΕΞΕ), Klein als Λ wiedergiebt (ΛΕΠΟΕ), konnte ich keine Spur mehr entdecken. Er kann sehr wohl dagewesen und im Verlaufe der Jahre erloschen sein, um so leichter als die Inschrift mit einer weissen, leicht zu zerstören-

den Farbe auf den schwarzen Firmisgrund aufgetragen ist. Von dem Verbum sind die drei Buchstaben ΕΠΟ ganz sicher; Postalaccas sah noch einen weitere Rest, welchem die obere Querhastia eines Epsilon zu sein scheint.

Nach diesen Wahrnehmungen durfte die bisher angenommene Lesung des Namens ΛΑΥΡΙΣ als beseitigt gelten und es blieb ein Name zu suchen, welcher den vorhandenen Buchstaben besser entsprach. Man würde hierbei auf dem Boden der Hypothese stehen geblieben sein, wäre nicht eine der 'découvertes ultérieures', auf welche de Witte hoffte, hinzugekommen. Das British Museum erwarb vor kurzem eine kleine, schwarzgefirnisste Pyxis, wahrscheinlich aus der Gegend von Aidin, auf deren Deckel in rotfiguriger Manier ein rechter Arm, ein Schwert in der Scheide haltend, und zur Linken, unter dem Arme, die in zwei Zeilen geschriebene purpur aufgemalte Künstlerinschrift

ΜΑΥΡΙΩΝ
ΕΠΟΙΕ

zu sehen ist. Kein Zweifel! Wir haben den fragmentirten Malernamen auf der Pyxis in *Kopenhagen* ebenfalls ΜΑΥΡΙΩΝ zu lesen. Auch dort wird das My die eigenthümliche Form mit den kurzen Schenkeln gehabt haben, woraus sich der Rest Λ erklärt. Der Rest (Λ) welchen Postalaccas vor dem ΕΠΟ... constatirte, ist der obere vordere Theil eines Ν.

Die Anwendung des Imperfectum ΕΠΟΙΕ auf der Pyxis im British Museum ist sicher. Möglicherweise war auch auf dem *Kopenhagener* Gefässe die gleiche Form ΕΠΟΙΕ oder ΕΠΟΕ verwendet, doch können wir, da die Pyxis hinter den angegebenen Buchstaben einen Bruch zeigt, dies nicht sicher erwissen.

Ueber die künstlerische Art des Vasenmalers *Maurion* ein Urtheil zu fällen, erscheint verwegen, gegenüber dem geringen Bilderschmuck, welchen die beiden kleinen Werke des Meisters in *Kopenhagen* und in *London* zeigen: hier ist, wie wir bereits oben sagten, nur ein Arm mit einem Schwerte, dort ein Krater, in ziemlich flüchtiger Weise, dargestellt. Für die Lebenszeit des Malers giebt uns jedoch der

¹ Die Verwendung weiblicher Arbeit in den Töpferwerkstätten Athens ist uns durch die Hydria der Sammlung Caputi in Ravo (*Annali*, 1876, Tav. D, E) für die mittleren Decennien des 5ten Jahrhunderts sicher bezeugt. Auf einem herrlichen, streng rotfigurigen Schalenfragmente von der Akropolis von Athen erscheint ebenfalls eine Frau in einer Töpferwerkstätte: leider ist nicht mehr zu erkennen, in welcher Weise sie beschäftigt war.

Charakter der Inschrift, wie ich glaube einen sicheren Anhalt. Das Omega einerseits und die zweizeitige Anordnung des Künstlerinschrift andererseits weisen in die mittleren Dezennien des 5ten Jahrhunderts; ein Zeitgenosse von ihm, Sotades, wendet dieselbe Form des Verbuns, ΕΓΟΕ, an.

Was den Namen Μαντίων an sich betrifft, welcher sonst, so viel ich sehe, nicht weiter bezeugt ist, so darf man wohl in Erwägung ziehen, ob wir in ihm nicht eine Weiterbildung von Μανρος und demnach in dem Vasenmaler einen nach Attika Zugewanderten oder einen ausländischen Sklaven zu erkennen haben, wie einen Σκύθης, einen Λυδός, und einen Σπρίσκος.

P. HARTWIG.

Rom, Sept. 1894.

C. SEPTIMIUS, PROCONSUL OF ASIA. B.C. 56-55.

THE late M. Waddington, in his invaluable treatise *Fastes des Provinces asiatiques de l'Empire romain*, 1872, gives the succession of the proconsuls of the Roman Province of Asia from Quintus Cicero to Claudius Pulcher as follows:—

Q. Tullius M. f. M. n. Cicero.....	B.C. 61-58.
C. Fabius M. f. [Hadrianus].....	B.C. 58-57.
T. Ampius T. f. [Balbus]	B.C. 57-56.
Name unknown	B.C. 56-55.
C. Claudius Ap. f. Pulcher	B.C. 55-53.

In my *History of the Coinage of Ephesus* (1880) (p. 72) I was able to show on the evidence of a previously unpublished Cistophorus of Ephesus dated ΟϚ (=76 of the era of Asia = B.C. 58-57) that the immediate successor of Q. Cicero was T. Ampius, and that the names of Fabius and Ampius must consequently be transposed.

A hitherto undeciphered Cistophorus of Tralles in Lydia now enables me to supply for the first time the name of the missing proconsul B.C. 56-55. The coin in question must have been seen by M. Waddington while he was occupied (1888-1893) on his Corpus of the coins of Asia Minor, daily visiting the British Museum and examining coin by coin every specimen in our National Collection.

As however this particular coin was very thickly coated with oxide I presume that he passed it by as hopelessly illegible; otherwise I think he would have consulted me (as was his wont in the case of obscure

coins) with regard to the reading of the inscription.

A few days ago, suspecting that this coin did not bear the name either of Ampius or Fabius, I subjected it to a careful process of cleaning. The oxide is now completely removed from its surface, and every letter of the inscription is clearly and even sharply legible as follows:—

C. SEPTIMIUS
T. F. PROCOS

Beneath the usual Bow-case and serpents is the name of the local Greek magistrate of Tralles ΠΟΛΥΔΕΥΚΗΣ accompanied by his personal signet or badge—the hat of one of the Dioseuri surmounted by a star.

There can therefore be now no room for doubt that C. Septimius T. f. is the name of the proconsul of the Province of Asia B.C. 56-55.

C. Septimius is mentioned by Cicero (*Red. in Sen. ix.*) among the seven Praetors for the year B.C. 57 who used their influence in supporting his (Cicero's) recall from exile.

The appointment of the ex-praetor, C. Septimius, to the proconsulship (in his case propraetorship with title of proconsul) of Asia is not recorded by any ancient writer, but, about four years after his return to Rome from Asia, we again meet with his name as one of the signatories (*qui scribendo adfuerunt*), of the Senatusconsultum M. Marcelli B.C. 51, where his name is given in full as C. Septimius T. f. Quirina (the last name being that of his tribe), (*Cael. ap. Cic. ad Fam. viii. 8.*) Again in two of Cicero's letters to Atticus written, according to Schmidt, on the 7th and 8th March B.C. 45, the name of C. Septimius appears as a member of the College of Augurs (*Cic. ad Att. xii. 13, 14.*)

Sooner or later a Cistophorus of Ephesus will I have no doubt be discovered bearing the date OH or OΘ (78-79 of the era of the Province of Asia, corresponding with B.C. 56-55), together with the name of C. SEPTIMIUS PROCOS, which will be useful as confirmatory evidence.

I may perhaps be allowed to take this opportunity of expressing an earnest hope that M. Waddington's MS. catalogue of all the known coins of Asia Minor may not be long withheld from publication. He showed it me in a complete state a few weeks before he left England early last year, telling me at the same time that on his return to France he would lose no time in placing it in the hands of the printers.

This catalogue (the result of no less than forty years' study) is not merely a description of M. Waddington's own collection (valuable indeed as that alone would be). It is a complete Corpus of the coins of Asia Minor in all the great European cabinets, each of which was in turn visited and minutely examined by M. Waddington. Mionnet's readings (frequently lamentably deficient) were all either verified or corrected by him, and thoroughly reliable descriptions were added of hundreds of coins which are as yet unpublished.

Who can say what new lights such a catalogue, by such a scholar as M. Waddington, might not throw upon the fragmentary history of Asia Minor in Greek and Roman times?

BARCLAY V. HEAD.

October, 1894. *British Museum.*

MONTHLY RECORD.

ITALY.

Great St. Bernard.—The excavation of the 'palm of Jupiter' has been completed, and the rest of the walls brought to light. Three votive tablets have been found: (1) C'VETTIVS SAL... P. P. LEG XV | V'S'L'M. The mention of the fifteenth legion without further specification points to a date when the Primigenia did not exist, i.e. before the time of Claudius, and when that legion was in Pannonia. (2) M'CASSIUS | FESTVS | MILES LEG X > IYLI | RVFI | V'S'L'M. The legion is that known as Gemina. (3) I'POENINO | IYLFORTV | NATVS EF' | COS | V'S'L'M. About fifty of these tablets are now known, one being in the British Museum. Among the finds were a small bronze statuette of Pallas, fibulae, weapons, stamped tiles, and 174 Gallic and Roman coins.¹

Pavia.—Part of an old Roman bridge has been discovered, close to the site of the modern bridge; it consists of a boat-shaped pier pointing up stream, formed of blocks clamped together, in three layers, the lowest projecting down stream. The shape of the upper end shows that the hydraulic principle of meeting the greatest resistance by oblique surfaces was recognized in antiquity. The bridge appears to have been completely made of stone, and may date from the Augustan age.²

Cortona.—An Etruscan cinerary urn of travertine has been found, incised $\Delta\Delta Q\Delta > | \cdot \Delta \Delta \Delta |$ $\Delta A \cdot \Delta \Delta \Delta \Delta$, *Vel·Karse Velchal*. *Karse* appears to be the original of the Latin name *Carseoli* or *Car-sulae*; *Velchal* is probably for *Velcia natus*. The inscription is of archaic date, as shown by the $> |$ for κ .¹

Corneto-Tarquini.—The excavations have been continued in the necropolis, and a tomb cleared out which contained an onyx scarab of the advanced archaic period, with a design of Peleus ($\Xi\Delta\Xi\Gamma$) and the young Achilles: Peleus is pouring oil from

a lekythos. Besides this, eight gold ornaments were found, one vase of bucchero, and five of Attic make; among the latter was a skyphos with black figures, whereon the painter had originally intended to depict a Dionysiac scene, but had abandoned his intention and transformed it into a group of Amazons. In the other tomb was a large *dolium* of clay containing a metal vase, fibulae and other remains.¹

Rome.—In Reg. x., on the way up to the Palatine, were found four fragments of a leaden pipe, one being inscribed IMP'DOMITIANI AVG'GER'SVB'CVRA' EPAGATHI AVG L | PROC'FEC'MARTIALIS'ET'ALEXANDER SER. It may be referred to the alteration of the *aqua Claudia* under Domitian, which brought water to the palace on the Palatine from the Celimontane aqueduct.²

Palestrina.—An interesting honorary inscription to Trajan has been brought to light. It runs: IMP' CAESARI DIVI NERVAE F | NERVAE TRAIANO AVGST | GERMANICO PONTIF MAX | TRIB' POTESTAT' COS III P P | DECVRIONES POPVLVSQVE. On the left is inscribed: DEDICATA XIII K'OCT | TI' CLAVDIO ATTALO MAMILIANO | T'SABIDIO SABINO TI VIR. It belongs to a statue of Trajan which was inaugurated A.D. 101, on September 18th, the Emperor's birthday.²

Terracina.—The site of the temple of Jupiter Anxur has been discovered on Monte S. Angelo near the city; it is mentioned by Livy, and this deity is alluded to by Virgil (*Aen.* vii. 799). A wall of limestone with a well-moulded cornice was recognized as the base of the temple, and fragments of mosaic paving were also discovered. Finally the entire plan was revealed, the dimensions being 33'50 x 19'70 metres. Among the remains were stamped tiles, lions' heads in alabaster, one drum of a column, votive objects in lead, and two marble bases. The latter are inscribed respectively DEXTER | VENERI | OPSEQUE ET | V'M'DON and CARPINATIA | FORTVNATA | VENERI V'S'L'M. It is clear that Venus had a sanctuary within the temple. The leaden votive objects consist of *crepundia* representing the furniture of a room, a table, couch, stool, side-board, candelabrum, etc., also pairs of *soleae* and a series of plates with fish on them (resembling the painted terra-cotta fish-plates sometimes found in Southern Italy, of which there are specimens in the Fourth Vase Room of the British Museum). Near the temple was a curious construction of rectangular walls built over a natural cave, either for an oracle, or more probably a *bi-dental*. Below is a large super-structure of arches, probably the *praetorium* Theodorici of a medieval writer, and behind the temple a portico in *opus incertum* covered with painted stucco, supported by Corinthian columns.²

Strongoli, Lucania (the ancient Petelia).—A marble pedestal of a statue has been found, with an honorary inscription to Manius Megonius Leo; on the left is an extract (*Kaput*) from his will. This inscription seems to show that Petelia was an important place in the second century of the empire; Leo was aedile, *quaestor pecuniae publicae*, *quattuorvir lege*, *patronus municipii*, and *quattuorvir quinquennialis*. His will seems to betray a great anxiety to be remembered by posterity. With this were found the left hand of a large bronze statue, wearing a ring, part of a large stone vase inscribed SACRVM, and a bronze coin of Faustina the younger.³

GREECE.

Eretria.—The American School has discovered, near the theatre, the foundation of a building which

¹ *Notizie dei Lincei*, Feb. 1894.

² *Ib.* March 1894.

³ *Notizie dei Lincei*, January 1894.

appears to be a temple of Dionysos. Between this and the western *parodos* of the theatre was a long stylobate with bases *in situ* for monuments of theatrical victories, as is shown by the fragmentary inscriptions. They have also found a row of large stone water-troughs, water-pipes, and part of an ancient street. East of the town a tumulus was opened, which had been erected round a tower twenty feet high; it contained no grave, and had already been opened in ancient times. In excavating the stylobate above mentioned was found a small but graceful head of Aphrodite.¹

CRETE.

Mr. Arthur Evans has published the results of his discoveries of early methods of writing among the Cretan people in the Mycenaean age. He has found numerous examples of seal-stones of a peculiar kind engraved with symbols of a hieroglyphic nature, and collected seventy of these symbols belonging to an independent hieroglyphic system. From stones of a similar form and also from pre-historic vases and other objects he has collected a series of linear characters, a certain proportion of which seem to have grown out of the pictorial forms. The hieroglyphs include parts of the human body, weapons and implements, animal and vegetable forms, maritime objects, and astronomical and geometrical signs; they show interesting affinities to the Hittite forms.

From the linear characters a Mycenaean script of twenty-four characters has been reconstructed, each probably having a syllabic value, a large proportion being identical with the signs of the Cypriote syllabary. They cannot be later in date than 1000 B.C., and must be previous to the introduction of the Phœnician alphabet. The relation of the picture-signs to the linear characters has not yet been elucidated, but they seem to be more or less contemporaneous. The former are perhaps indigenous to Crete, and the latter Mycenaean in the widest sense. Another result of these discoveries is to show that the Philistines were the old indigenous stock of Crete, and that it was consequently they who used these signs.

The researches of Dr. Halbherr in this island have done much to corroborate Mr. Evans' discoveries, he having also found stones with syllabic signs. On the south side of Mt. Ida he has investigated three tombs of Mycenaean date, containing numerous vases. He has also discovered two towns hitherto unknown, from one of which came a series of inscriptions, one of the archaic period, fragments of fine Mycenaean vases, and archaic Greek pottery with reliefs. In a grotto near Lebena he found vases of the Thera class, also objects of stone, and a pre-historic habitation, and in another grotto numerous fragments of very ancient pottery.²

CARIA.

Mr. Paton has found an inscription which identifies the site of the Carian Telmessos, and assists in the identification of several other important sites. The inscription in question, with plans, &c., will be published in the forthcoming number of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. xiv. part 1.

1. The Hymn to Apollo: an essay in the Homeric question. A. W. Verrall.

2. The Chest of Kypselos. H. S. Jones.

A reconstruction by the light of recent discoveries

¹ *Berl. Phil. Wochenschr.* 7 July 1894.

² *Academy*, 25 August and *Times*, 29 August.

of Corinthian pottery and metal-work, reproducing the specially Corinthian features of the work.

3. Animal-worship in the Mycenaean Age. A. B. Cook.

Discussing the cult of various animals as illustrated by gems and other monuments on which appear human figures dressed up as animals, and the relation of this cult to Totemism and anthropomorphic worship, between which it appears to be intermediate.

4. A lecythus from Eretria with the death of Priam. E. A. Gardner.

Shows how the Epic tradition is modified by artistic and technical influences; also discusses history of painting in black figures on white ground.

5. Selected Vase-fragments from the Acropolis of Athens.—II. G. C. Richards.

Publishes several red-figured fragments.

6. Greek Head, in the possession of T. Humphry Ward, Esq. Eugénie Sellers.

The stylistic affinities point to Kalamis or one of his school as the sculptor.

7. Polledrara ware. Cecil Smith.

A republication of the hydria with Theseus and the Minotaur, and of the bronze female bust.

8. Archaeology in Greece, 1893-4. E. A. Gardner.

H. B. Walters.

Archäologisches Jahrbuch. 1894, part 4. Berlin.

1. Schöne: a study of the Nekyia of Polygnotos, with especial reference to Robert's monograph. (i) He shows that there is no evidence for supposing that the figures were life size, nor that their arrangement and indications of scenery were like those of the vases usually quoted: probably only four colours on a white ground were employed: and with a very high horizon the perspective effect was somewhat similar to that of Oriental pictures. (ii) He discusses the Descent into Hades, the representation of the Shades, and the relation of these pictures to the Homeric Nekyia; concluding that Polygnotos 'adhered to the idea of the shadow world which each of his contemporaries who knew the Odyssey must have held.' (iii) He makes some suggestions as to the divergent views existing in regard to the relative positions of certain figures in the composition. 2. Mayer: explains the much-debated Splanchnoptes motive as that of a boy holding up meat on a spit, which is found on vases: and identifies it with a marble statue of an epebeus found at the Olympieion at Athens in 1888: plate and cuts. 3. Strzowski: studies the column of Arcadius at Constantinople, reviewing the extant ruins, the description of Gyllius, the view of Sandys (1610) and a detailed drawing of Cassas (died 1827): also the drawing by Melchior Loreh (1557) noted in *Arch. Jahrb.* 1892, p. 91: and compares the column of Theodosius: cuts.

Anzeiger. Report of the boundary commission from the end of Nov. 1892-1893. Acquisitions of the British Museum in 1892. Antiquities of Stift-Neuburg at Heidelberg. Notes on Attic terra-cotta slabs, by Masner: on the *παρὰ σκευή* in the east pediment at Olympia, by Six: on a vase with Herakles sacrificing, by Körte, with rejoinder by Furtwängler.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. 1893. August-December. Paris.

1. Couve and Bourguet: publish the inscriptions from the polygonal wall at Delphi discovered by Haussoullier in 1880 and as yet unedited: they are a hundred and nine in number, and all deeds of enfranchisement, mostly of the normal type: to this is appended an index of proper names. 2. Michon: publishes (plate 16) a headless statue of

a draped woman in the Louvre: this statue was acquired in 1829 by the former owner at Halicarnassus: though of good Greek work, it does not seem to have belonged to the Mausoleum. 3. Lechat: the archaic Elgin head in the British Museum (*Cat.* 150) is the head of a Sphinx. 4. S. Reinach: suggests the restoration, on the authority of Cyriac, of a new sculptor's name, Thrasyxenos of Paros. 5. Pottier: continues his series of 'documents céramiques' of the Louvre: (ii) vases of Ionian type; Ionism in Attika. 6. Joubin: publishes two decrees of proxenia and a deed of enfranchisement found by him at Stratos in 1892. 7. Lemnios: two inscriptions of Cyzicus. 8. Svoronos: a long article on the numismatics and history of Mykonos. 9. Diehl: publishes an inscription in Greek and Latin found in 1889 by Cousin at Ali-faradin on the borders of Pisidia and Kibyrtis: it is a rescript of the emperors Justin and Justinian, assuring imperial

protection to the oratory of St. John, A.D. 527. 10. Lechat and Radet: thirty-nine inscriptions of Mysia (cf. *ante* xii. p. 187). 11. Legrand: sixty inscriptions of Mysia and Bithynia. 12. Diamantaras: coins of Lycia. 13. Weil publishes the text of the Delphic hymn; and 14. S. Reinach gives the new fragments with musical notation and a long critical study of their bearing on our knowledge of Greek music.

Institute. Homolle's report on Delphi, and (p. 616) two Delphian inscriptions giving the accounts of the temple administration: Svoronos' interpretation of astronomical types on coins (p. 618), applied to coins of Crete (p. 621), especially the famous Gortyna type. News and correspondence: Athens, Peloponnesus, Islands, &c. including three new Orphic inscriptions from Eleutheræ (cf. *ante*, p. 121).

C. S.

OBITUARY.

WILLIAM ALEXANDER GREENHILL, M.D.

As the only English physician of the present century who had devoted himself to the ancient literature of his profession, Dr. Greenhill claims some mention in the pages of the *Classical Review*. Very full and appreciative notices have appeared in the *Athenæum* and the *Guardian*, as well as in the local papers, and in these his many-sided activity, disinterested character, and sound and zealous churchmanship have been set forth in attractive colours. We shall here speak of him chiefly as the exponent of the Greek and Latin, and, incidentally, of the Arabic medical literature.

William Alexander Greenhill was born on Jan. 1, 1814, of a family which had an hereditary connexion with the Stationers' Company; his father having been treasurer of the Company, his elder brother, who died not long since, secretary and afterwards Master. In 1828 he went to Rugby at the beginning of Arnold's headmastership, and there he laid the foundation of his sound scholarship. He was a favourite pupil of the great Doctor, whose niece he ultimately married; and among such schoolfellows as Deans Stanley, Vaughan, and Lake, he was regarded as not the least promising of the brilliant band.

In 1832 he went to Trinity College, Oxford, where he held an exhibition. Here he at first gave himself up to desultory reading, instead of working for the schools: in after life he attributed this to the inferiority of the college lectures as compared

with Arnold's teaching, but owned that he had acted priggishly in giving way to this feeling.

After a year or two he thought better of it, but it was then too late to read for honours, and in the end he took no degree in Arts, graduating M.B. in 1839 and M.D. in 1841.

Together with his scientific studies he cultivated that literary side of the profession which he made so completely his own.

The Bodleian is rich in Arabic MSS., and it is understood that these, as well as printed sources, were laid under contribution. On his marriage he settled in Oxford, and began practice as a physician. Here he was one of Newman's parishioners, and for some time his churchwarden. His first publication, in 1842, was the Greek text of the anatomical treatise of Theophilus Protospatharius, *περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασκευῆς*, in a more complete form than had yet appeared. In the same year he contributed the medical articles to Dr. (afterwards Sir William) Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*. In the last edition of this work he was the only one of the original writers (except the late Dr. Leonhard Schmitz to a slight extent) who revised his own contributions. Some years later he wrote the lives of the ancient physicians for the *Dictionary of Biography* in the same series. In 1844 he was chosen by the Sydenham Society to edit the Latin works of its eponymous hero. Soon afterwards

he translated the work of Rhazes *On Small-pox and Measles* for the first time from the original Arabic; previous English versions having been made from the Greek or Latin.

About 1852 Dr. Greenhill left Oxford and settled at Hastings. Here, in addition to his practice, he was the life and soul of every philanthropic and sanitary scheme, especially of the Hastings Cottage Improvement Society. He was also conspicuous in church and parish work; and the notices which have appeared since his death testify to the affection and reverence with which he was regarded by his fellow-townsmen. His old age was not free from sorrows. His elder daughter died of consumption, and his elder son was cut off in the midst of a promising career as an undergraduate; Mrs. Greenhill did not long survive this double loss. His literary work continued. Some years ago he brought out an elaborate edition of Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*, and at the time of his death was

engaged upon the same author's *Hyarotaphia*. He also contributed largely to *Notes and Queries*, and to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, the last volume of which, published since his death, includes the life of Dr. J. B. Mozley, the Regius Professor of Divinity. The subjects of his biographies were mostly Oxford celebrities. Besides his distinguished schoolfellows already mentioned, he was the friend of almost every eminent Oxonian of his time; of Pusey, Newman and Keble; of Deans Church, Goulburn, Liddell and Scott; of Dr. Mozley; of Dr. Ogle and Sir Henry Acland, Regius Professors of Physic; and of Mr. Gladstone. He had long suffered from a heart trouble, and on Sept. 19 he passed away after two hours' illness, in his 81st year; having kept up his literary labours to the last. A son and a daughter survive him.

W. W.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Classical Studies in honour of Henry Drisler.

New York, Macmillan and Co. 1894.

This sumptuous volume commemorates in German fashion the fiftieth year of Dr. Drisler's official connection with Columbia College. It consists of twenty-one papers by his pupils on various subjects connected with classical philology or archaeology, with the exception of three which are concerned with oriental literature. (1) *On the meaning of nauta and viator in Hor. Sat. i. 5, 11-23*, by S. G. Ashmore. After an examination of various parallel passages and the views of commentators the writer concludes that the *viator* is a 'man on foot, whose destination lay in the same direction as that of Horace's party, and who was too poor to pay his fare by boat. He joins the *nauta* who is guiding the mule, and the two men sing as they go.' (2) *Anaximander on the prolongation of infancy in man*, by N. M. Butler. This note on the history of the theory of evolution calls attention to the remarkable way in which certain pre-Socratic thinkers, especially Anaximander and Xenophanes, anticipated some modern discoveries. It is clear, for instance, from a fragment of Anax. that he 'observed and understood the main point in connection with the prolongation of the period of infancy in man; namely, that it affords a needed opportunity for the adjustment of the complex physical and psychical activities to their environment,'—a point which has recently been drawn out by Messrs. Spencer, Fiske, and Wallace. (3) *Of two passages in Euripides' Medea*, by M. L. Earle. In the much-vexed l. 12 Dr. Earle would read *ἀργή* for *φύγη* after Musgrave, and in the next line change *αὐτῇ* to *αὐτῷ*. For *ἀφικόμεν* in 503 he would read *ἀφῆκαμεν*—a change which hardly seems required. (4) *The preliminary military service of the equestrian Cursus Honorum*, by J. C. Egbert, junr. From a study of the inscrip-

tions of the empire it appears that the equestrian military service during the three centuries of its history assumed four different forms. I. *Tribunatus militum*, II. *Tribunatus cohortis vigilium, cohortis urbanae, cohortis praetoriae*, III. *Praefectus cohortis, tribunus militum, praefectus alae*, IV. *Praefectura alae*. The *praefectura (castrorum) legionis* became a part of the *militiae equestres* under Septimius Severus. At first this military service merely led to civil offices, but from the time of Hadrian the military career assumes an importance of its own. (5) *References to Zoroaster in Syriac and Arabic literature*, by R. J. H. Gottheil. (6) *Literary frauds among the Greeks*, by A. Gudeman. This paper draws attention to some of the more important and interesting literary frauds beginning with Onomacritus (Hdt. vii. 6). The entire classical period gives no clear case, which will not surprise us in such an age of originality of thought and expression, and at a time when no class of reading public had yet arisen. They first appeared in the guise of interpolations, a common example of which is the practice of actors to tamper with the text of the dramatists. The centuries following the time of Aristotle were fruitful in forgeries. (i) In poetry Heraclides Ponticus is instanced as introducing us to the mythical predecessors of Homer, viz. Philammon, Linos, and Amphion. Some of the odes of Sappho, the didactic sayings of Theognis, and the erotic songs of Anacreon were so much diluted with the effusions of unknown bards that it is often most difficult and sometimes impossible to separate the genuine from the spurious. (ii) In philosophical literature we find a long list of forgeries, which owe their existence principally to two causes, one being a pecuniary inducement and the other a desire to increase for purposes of propaganda the material of certain sects, particularly

the Neo-Platonic and the Neo-Pythagorean. Examples are found in the spurious writings of Plato, most of the esoteric works attributed to Aristotle, but most of all in the pseudo-Pythagorean writings. (iii) Literary frauds however reached their culmination in the department of epistolary composition. 'There is scarcely an illustrious personality in Greek literature or history from Themistocles down to Alexander, who was not credited with a more or less extensive correspondence.' But not all apocryphal writings were the result of fraud. Thus the class of poems known as the Epic Cycle was generally attributed to Homer down to the time of Zenodotus, so the Corpus Hippocraticum was increased by spurious medical treatises. (7) *Henotheism in the Rig-Veda*, by E. W. Hopkins. (8) *On Plato and the Attic Comedy*, by G. B. Hussey. There is probably no direct connection between the Ecclesiastusae and Plato's Republic. 'Both are an outcome of the same state of restless thinking and love for reconstruction that was then prevalent among the Athenians.' However, in the few fragments we possess of the works of Theopompus, who belongs partly to the Old and partly to the New Comedy, we seem to discover the first instances of a direct parody of the Republic. We see this in the *Σπαριαρίδες* and the *Καρναίδες*. (9) *Herodotus vii. 61, or ancient Persian armour*, by A. V. W. Jackson. The purpose of this paper is to 'summarize the main results already arrived at with reference to the description which Herodotus gives of the Persian armour, and then to test the passage in the light of standards drawn from Iranian literature, the Avesta, Old Persian inscriptions, Pahlavi books, and later Persian writings, as well as from some non-Iranian sources, and also from the monuments and rock-sculptures of Iran itself.' It is illustrated from bas-reliefs and especially by a plate of the Dieulafoy frieze of archers from Susa. (10) *Archaism in Aulus Gellius*, by C. Knapp. Gellius' fondness for the old writers and his habitual study of their works is well-attested. Among poets Plautus and Ennius, among orators Cato Censor stand highest in his estimation. In all this Gellius is in accord with the literary tendencies of his time. Fronto and Apuleius show the same fondness for all that is archaic in vocabulary and style. The whole is illustrated by a list of archaisms from Gellius. (11) *On certain parallelisms between the ancient and the modern drama*, by B. Matthews. A slight paper. The writer thinks that Euripides in composing the Medea was 'fitting' some Athenian actor, that the Oedipus Rex is scarcely more skillfully contrived than Ibsen's 'Ghosts,' and that the 'topical song' of the modern burlesque resembles the parabasis of the Old Comedy. (12) *Ovid's use of colour and of colour-terms*, by N. G. McCrea. In order to determine Ovid's colour preferences, all instances of his use of each colour-term are given. 'Ovid decidedly prefers the most luminous colours, markedly exceeding the spectrum proportion in yellow, and, to a less extent, in green.' (13) *A bronze of Polyclitan affinities in the Metropolitan Museum*, by A. C. Merriam. This paper, illustrated by a plate, describes a bronze statuette found in Cyprus by General di Cesnola. The writer thinks it may be a copy from the statue of Cyniscus by Polyclitus, and would assign it to the middle of the fifth century and to the Peloponnesian school. (14) *Geryon in Cyprus*, by A. C. Merriam. A description of the three shields on the largest statue of Geryon from Cyprus, from which the conclusion is drawn that it is a work of the second half of the sixth century. (15) *Hercules, Hydra, and Crab*, by A. C. Merriam. This is concerned with the instances where the crab appears as an antagonist of the hero whether with or without the hydra. An

illustration is given from a mutilated group found by General di Cesnola. (16) *Onomatopoeic words in Latin*, by H. T. Peck. The Latin language was rich in the most primitive kind of onomatopoeias, those which are formed directly in imitation of some natural sound, and there is ample proof that the Romans recognized and enjoyed these words. A list of rare onomatopoeic words follows. (17) *Notes on the Vedic deity Pusan*, by E. D. Perry. (18) *The so-called Medusa Ludovisi*, by J. Sachs. This paper is an able argument to show that this relief represents not Medusa but Pentheseilea dying, but at a later stage than appears in the archaic Amazon torso of Vienna. There is nothing to show whether the so-called Medusa is part of an independent figure or a fragment of a group. The paper is adorned with two beautiful plates, of the so-called Medusa and of the Vienna torso. (19) *Aristotle and the Arabs*, by W. M. Sloane. A historical account of the Arabian appreciation of Aristotle, more particularly of Avicenna. It is maintained that the Arabian philosophy was much more than the mere 'insensate strong box' in which the Peripatetic system was locked up for a few centuries. (20) *Iphigenia in Greek and French Tragedy*, by B. D. Woodward. A comparison between Euripides and Racine. (21) *Gargettus, an Attic Dome*, by C. H. Young. An elaborate account of the history of this dome, with a list of all the people known to have belonged to it in literature or by inscriptions. The only important name in literature is that of Epicurus.

Transactions of the American Philological Association, 1893. Vol. xxiv.

(1) *The scientific emendation of classical texts*, by E. A. Sonnenschein. The canons here laid down are exemplified by Plautus, whose text presents two problems—the problem of MSS. and that of metre and prosody. The first step is to examine into the relations of the extant MSS. to one another and to arrange them in families, the next to infer the probable reading of the archetype or archetypes, and the last (if necessary) to bring all the resources of palaeography, logic and observation of the language of the author to bear upon the problem of emending the text. Prof. Sonnenschein also says that the critic 'may be called upon to put into a lacuna of the text something which the author himself might have written'—surely a most dangerous doctrine. (2) *On the canons of etymological investigation*, by M. Bréal. Prof. Bréal reminds the reader of a few rules which are too often forgotten by the lexicographer: (i) he must conform to the lessons taught by phonetics, (ii) he should always be careful to distinguish the suffixes. A dictionary of words arranged according to their suffixes is a great desideratum, (iii) he must examine the concordance of meanings as minutely as the concordance of forms. A protest is rightly made against the habit which linguists have of accumulating in the prototypes they invent all the phonetic elements presented by their descendants. Thus the *Ursprache* after being praised for its harmony 'has suddenly come to be the least sonorous and most rugged of tongues.' (3) *Ein Ablaut problem der Ursprache*, by W. Streitberg. (4) *Dunkles und helles im Lateinischen*, by H. Osthoff. I have purposely refrained from summarizing these papers as they are printed in the original German. To give papers in a foreign language in a periodical meant for English-speaking readers is a fraud upon them, for it cannot be presumed that all understand German. If the papers are worth printing they are also worth translation. (5) *The implicit ethics and psychology of Thucydides*, by P. Shorey. Thucydides' philosophy of life is

considered under two aspects: (i) ethical positivism, (ii) intellectualism. Under the first head it is shown that he regarded the nature and conduct of man as 'strictly determined by his physical and social environment and by a few elementary appetites and desires,' that while the naïve man is duped by the moral drapery thrown round this primitive core the wise man discovers the naked human nature beneath. On the intellectual side Thucydides is constantly preoccupied with the part in life played by the conscious calculating reason. All this is excellently illustrated from the History. Prof. Shorey is not a thorough-going admirer of the style of Thucydides. He remarks, 'often what we take for a new substantive thought is merely an ingenious variation on a commonplace theme. Often periphrases that are apparently wrapped around a kernel of profound suggestion are found empty when unfolded.' This he attributes to the study of the formal rhetoric of the day. (6) *English words which have gained or lost an initial consonant by attraction*, by C. P. G. Scott. This is a second paper, the previous one was published in the *Transactions* for 1892. Unfortunately the writer is a prey to the silly affectation of writing 'publisht, hav, ar, speld, gon, wer,' etc. etc., which makes an interesting subject matter too tiresome to read. Luckily it is not connected with classical

philology, so I am not compelled to read it. If we are to reform our spelling we shall not stop here, (7) '*Extended*' and '*remote*' *Deliberatives in Greek*, by W. G. Hale. This admirable paper is the gem of the collection. Prof. Hale here gathers up all that has been written on this subject in the grammars and lately in the *Classical Review* and expounds his own views. With regard to (1) the extended deliberative, i.e. cases like *ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν εἰς ὃ τι βλέπω*, he concludes that the subordinate clause is a true deliberative and not derived from a clause of purpose. One reason against the latter view is that in all the Homeric clauses of purpose expressed by the subj., with one exception, the mood is accompanied by *ἔν* or *κε*. With regard to (2) the so-called remote deliberative, as seen e.g. in *οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξαιμι τὰ ψευδῆ καλᾶ*, he concludes that the most probable solution is that these are cases of ordinary potentials and equivalent in sense to optatives with *ἄν*. These seven papers are here published in full. A good many others were also read and discussed at the annual 'Proceedings' and abstracts of them are given in the appendix. Altogether the present publication in no way falls below the high standard attained by the previous numbers.

R. C. S.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Appian*. Civil Wars. Book I. Translated by E. F. M. Benecke. Cr. 8vo. Sewed. Blackwell.
- Benecke* (E. F. M.) *Poetarum Latinorum Index in usum versificatorum nostratum conflatus*. Post 8vo. 172 pp. Methuen. 4s. 6d.
- Cæsar*. Tales of the Civil War. Adapted for the use of beginners, with vocabulary, notes and exercises by Charles Haines Keene. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Gallic War. Books I and II. Edited by T. W. Haddon and G. C. Harrison, with plans and illustrations. Cr. 8vo. xxxvi, 107 pp. E. Arnold. 1s. 6d. net.
- Gallic War. Books I—VII. Literally translated from the text of Hoffmann, by St. George Stock. Post 8vo. 140 pp. Shrimpton. 3s. 6d.
- Invasion of Britain. Gallic War IV. 20—28: V. 1—23. With introduction, notes, &c., by J. Brown. 12mo. Blackie. 1s. 6d.
- Cherbuliez* (V.) *A Phidian Horse: art and archaeology on the Acropolis; from the French by Elizabeth Hill Bissell Roberts*. 16mo. 331 pp. Philadelphia, John Wanamaker.
- Church* (Rev. A. J.) *Pictures from Greek Life and Story, with illustrations*. Post 8vo. 316 pp. Hutchinson. 3s. 6d.
- *The Fall of Athens. A Story of the Peloponnesian War*. With 16 illustrations. Post 8vo. 336 pp. Seeley. 5s.
- Cicero's Correspondence*, arranged according to its chronological order, with a revision of the text, a commentary, and introductory essays, by Robert Yelverton Tyrrell and Louis Claude Purser. Vol. 4. 8vo. 598 pp. Longmans. 12s.
- Cicero*. Speeches against Catilina and Antony, and for Murena and Milo, translated by H. E. D. Blackiston. Cr. 8vo. Methuen. 5s.
- Cicero*. Orations against Catilina. By A. S. Wilkins. New and revised edition. Macmillan. 2s. 6d.
- *Pro Milone*. Edited for Schools and Colleges, by James S. Reid. 12mo. 160 pp. Cambridge Press. 2s. 6d.
- *In Verrem*. Actio II. Chapter IV. De Signis. Literally translated by J. A. Prout. 12mo. 70 pp. Cornish. 1s. 6d.
- Cook* (A. M.) and *Pantin* (W. E.) *Key to Macmillan's Shorter Latin Course. Second Part*. Cr. 8vo. Macmillan. 4s. 6d.
- Curtius* (Quintus.) Selections from, adapted for the use of beginners, with vocabulary, notes, and exercises, edited by F. Coverley Smith. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Davidson* (J. L. Strachan.) *Cicero and the Fall of the Roman Republic*. Post 8vo. 449 pp. Putnam. 5s.
- Ellis* (R.) *The Fables of Phædrus, an inaugural lecture*. 8vo. Sewed. Clarendon Press. 1s. net.
- Euripides*. *Alcestis*. Edited by Mortimer Lamson Earle. 12mo. 244 pp. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.
- *Hecuba*. With introduction and notes, by W. S. Hadley. Fcp. 8vo. Cambridge Press. 2s. 6d.
- Freeman* (E. A.) *The History of Sicily, from the Earliest Times*. Vol. 4. From the tyranny of Dionysios to the death of Agathokles. Edited from posthumous MSS., with supplement and notes by A. J. Evans. Maps and Numismatic plate. 8vo. 578 pp. Clarendon Press. 21s.
- Goodwin* (W. W.) *Greek Grammar*. New edition, revised and enlarged. Cr. 8vo. Macmillan. 6s.
- Holm* (Adolph.) *The History of Greece from its Commencement to the Close of the Independence of the Greek Nation*. Translated from the German. (4 Vols.) Vol. I. up to the end of the sixth century, B.C. 8vo. Macmillan. 6s. net.

- Homer.* Iliad. Edited by Arthur Platt. Post 8vo. 520 pp. Cambridge Warehouse. 4s. 6d.
 ———— Odyssey. Books V.—VII. Edited on the basis of the Ameis-Hentze edition, by B. Perrin. 8vo. E. Arnold. 6s.
Infamia, its Place in Roman Public and Private Law, by A. H. J. Greenidge. 8vo. xii, 219 pp. Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d.
Innes (A. D.) Verse Translations from the Greek and Latin Poets. Chiefly of passages chosen for translation at sight. 8vo. 156 pp. Innes. 5s. net.
Isocrates. Orationes. Translated by J. H. Freese, with introduction and notes. Vol. I. 12mo. 354 pp. Bell & Sons. 5s.
Juvenal. Satires I., III., IV. Text and notes. Edited by A. H. Allcroft. Clive. 3s. 6d.
Livy. History of Rome. Book IX. Translated by F. Storr. 12mo. Sewed. Bell & Sons. 1s.
Lucian. Six Dialogues, translated into English with an introduction by Sidney T. Irwin. Post 8vo. 212 pp. Methuen. 3s. 6d.
Macmillan's Shorter Latin Course. Second part. Being an abridgment of the Second part of Macmillan's Latin Course, by A. M. Cook and W. E. P. Pantin. 12mo. 204 pp. Macmillan. 2s.
Meissner (C.) Latin Phrase Book. Translated from the sixth German edition, with the addition of supplementary phrases and references, by H. W. Auden. 12mo. 324 pp. Macmillan. 4s. 6d.
Monro (D. B.) The Modes of Ancient Greek Music. 8vo. Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d. net.
Niebuhr (B. G.) Stories of Greek Heroes. Edited with notes and vocabularies, by H. S. Beresford-Webb. 12mo. 128 pp. Rivington. 2s.
Plato. Gorgias. With English notes, introduction and appendix by W. H. Thompson. Post 8vo. Bell & Sons. 6s.
Platonis Hippias Maior. Edited for the upper forms of schools, by George Smith. Rivington, Percival & Co. 3s. 6d.
Plato. Phaedo. Edited, with introduction, notes, and appendices, by R. D. Archer-Hind. 2nd ed. 8vo. 210 pp. Macmillan. 8s. 6s. net.
 ———— Republic. Translated by Thomas Taylor. Edited with an introduction by Theodore Wratistlaw. 12mo. 306 pp. W. Scott. 1s. 6d.
Plautus. Captivi. Abridged and edited with introduction and notes, by J. H. Freese. 12mo. Methuen. 1s. 6d.
Shuckburgh (Evelyn S.) A History of Rome to the Battle of Actium, with maps and plans. Post 8vo. 816 pp. Macmillan. 8s. 6d.
Smith (R. H.) The Theory of Conditional Sentences in Greek and Latin, for the use of Students. 8vo. 670 pp. Macmillan. 21s. net.
Smyth (H. W.) The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects. Vol. I. Ionic. 8vo. 682 pp. Clarendon Press. 24s.
Stedman (A. M. M.) A Vocabulary of Latin Idioms and Phrases. 16mo. 40 pp. Methuen. 1s.
Summers (W. C.) A Study of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus. 8vo. Sewed. 76 pp. Deighton, Bell & Co.
Tacitus. Annalium ab Excessu Divi Augusti Libri. By H. Furneaux. Text. Cr. 8vo. Clarendon Press. 6s.
 ———— Germania. Edited, with introduction, &c., by R. F. Davis. 12mo. Methuen. 2s.
 ———— Germania. Edited, with introduction, notes and map, by Henry Furneaux. 8vo. 122 pp. Clarendon Press. 6s. 6d.
Thucydides II., III. The Fall of Plataea and the Plague at Athens. Edited for the use of beginners, by W. T. Sutthery and A. S. Graves. With map, exercises, notes, appendices and vocabulary. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
Tutorial Latin Reader; a graduated series of extracts for practice in translation at sight. 12mo. 160 pp. Clive. 2s. 6d.
Virgil. Works. A literal translation by A. Hamilton Bryce, with introduction and memoir. Post 8vo. Bell & Sons. 3s. 6d.
 ———— Aeneid. Books I.—VI. Edited, with introduction and notes, by T. E. Page. 12mo. 524 pp. Macmillan. 6s.
Xenophon. Goodwin and White's *Anabasis* revised throughout by the original editors, with an introduction. 12mo. Giun & Co. Boston.
 ———— Hellenics. Books 4 and 5. Literally translated by J. A. Prout. 12mo. 72 pp. Cornish. 2s.
Young (A. W.) Tutorial Greek Reader, or Proemia Graeca: a book of easy and entertaining extracts in Attic Greek, introductory to the fuller study of the Greek authors, with notes and complete vocabulary. Post 8vo. 130 pp. Clive. 2s. 6d.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Abhandlungen (Breslauer Philologische). Herausgegeben von Prof. Rich. Förster. vii. Bd. 1. Heft. Breslau, Köbner.
 [De oraculis chaldaicis, scripsit Gu. Kroll. 78 pp. 3 Mk. 60.]
Aesop. Sternbach (L.) fabularum Aesopiarum sylloge. E codice Parisino Gr. N. 690 suppl. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der K. Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Krakau.') 8vo. Krakau. 83 pp. 3 Mk.
Agathias (Reffel, H.) Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Agathias. 8vo. Kempten, 1894. 84 pp.
Anthologia Graeca. Stadtmüller (H.) Zur griechischen Anthologie. Festschrift. 4to. Heidelberg, 1894. 10 pp.
Apuleius von Madaura (Apologie des). Zum ersten Male übersetzt von Dr. F. Weiss. 8vo. Leipzig, Reissland. xxii, 88 pp. 2 Mk.
Aristophanes. Gli uccelli, tradotti in versi italiani da Aug. Franchetti, con introduzioni e note di Dom. Comparetti. 16mo. Città di Castello. liv, 125 pp.
 ———— Pièces choisies d'Aristophane, avec une introduction et notes par G. Ferte. 16mo. Paris. 219 pp.
Aristoteles. Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca, edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. vii. 8vo. Berlin, Reimer. [Vol. vii. Simplicii in Aristotelis de caelo commentaria, ed. J. L. Heiberg. xvi, 780 pp. 30 Mk.]
Aristotle. Essen (E.) Das 2. Buch der aristotelischen Schrift über die Seele in kritischer Uebersetzung. Mit einem offenen Briefe an Herrn Geh. Reg. Rath Susenhihl als Vorrede. 8vo. Jena, Neuenhahn. 94 pp. 2 Mk. 50.
Augustae historiae scriptores. Lenze (W.) Quaes-

- tiones criticae et grammaticae ad scriptores historiae Augustae pertinentes. 8vo. Münster, 1894. 47 pp.
- Blondel* (J. E.) Histoire économique de la conjuration de Catilina. 8vo. Lille. viii, 430 pp.
- Boussion* (R.) Grammaire grecque simplifiée et augmentée d'un précis. 8vo. Paris. ii, 151 pp. 2 Fr. 50.
- Chassang* (A.) et *Clairin* (P.) Nouvelle chrestomathie grecque et exercices grecs (classe cinquième). Crown 8vo. Paris. iv, 107 pp.
- Choppard* (L.) et *Hannezo* (G.), Note sur la nécropole romaine d'Hadjeb-el-Aïoun. Nouvelles découvertes dans la nécropole romaine d'Hadrumète. 8vo. Paris. 16 pp., 2 plates. (Extrait du Bulletin archéologique.)
- Ciceronis* (M. Tulli.) De officiis libri iii, scholarum in usum iterum ed. Al. Kornitzer. 12 mo. Wien, Gerald. iii, 213 pp.
- Claudian.* Masetius Arcturus. De Claudii Claudiani raptu Proserpinae disputatio. 16mo. Bononiae. 11 pp.
- Corpus inscriptionum latinarum consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. vii, Supplementum, part ii. Folio. Berlin, Reimer.
- [ii. Inscriptionum provinciae Numidinae latinarum supplementum, ed. R. Cagnat et Jo. Schmidt, commentariis instr. Jo. Schmidt et H. Dessau. v, et pp. 1667—1903. 22 Mk.
- Cyprian.* Demmler (A.) Ueber den Verfasser der unter Cyprian's Namen überlieferten Traktate, De bono pudicitiae und De spectaculis. 8vo. München, 1893. 54 pp.
- Donatus.* Schellwien (Alf.) De Cledonii in Donatum commentario. 8vo. Königsberg, Koch. 64 pp. 1 Mk.
- Dragendorff* (J.) De vasculis Romanorum rubris capita selecta. 8vo. Bonn, 1894. 34 pp., 1 plate.
- Euripides.* Jöhring (J.) Ist die 'Alkestis' des Euripides eine Tragödie? 8vo. Feldkirch, 1894. 19 pp.
- Florus.* Schmüdinger (F.) Untersuchungen über Florus. 8vo. München, 1894. 36 pp.
- Fondation Eugène Piot. Monuments et mémoires publiés par l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, sous la direction de G. Perrot et Rob. de Lasteyrie, avec le concours de P. Jamot. Tome i, fasc. 1. 4to. Paris. xxiii, 104 pp.
- Gillbauer* (Mich.) Die drei Systeme der griechischen Tachygraphie. (Aus: 'Denkschriften der Akademie der Wissenschaften.') Imper. 4to. Wien, 50 pp., 4 plates. 3 Mk. 60.
- Glue* (H.) De homicidarum in Arcopago Atheniensi iudicio. 8vo. Göttingen, 1894. 52 pp.
- Gomperz* (Prof. Dr. Theod.) Griechische Denker. Eine Geschichte der antiken Philosophie. 3. hfg. 8vo. Leipzig, Veit. Pp. 193—288. 2 Mk.
- Grammatik (historische) der lateinischen Sprache. Bearbeitet von H. Blase, G. Landgraf, J. H. Schmalz, Fr. Stolz, Jos. Thüssing, C. Wagener, A. Weinhold. 1 Bd., 1 Hälfte. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner.
- [I, 1: Einleitung und Lautlehre von F. Stolz. xii, 364 pp. 7 Mk.]
- Herodote.* Hauvette (A.) Hérodote, historien des guerres médiques. 8vo. Paris. xi, 513 pp. 10 Fr.
- Stourac (F.) Ueber den Gebrauch des Genitivus bei Herodot. (Fortsetzung). 8vo. Olmütz, 1894. 26 pp.
- Hervieux* (L.) Les fabulistes latins depuis le siècle d'Auguste à la fin du moyen âge: Phèdre et ses anciens imitateurs, directs et indirects. 2de édition, entièrement refondue. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris. xii, 834, 814 pp.
- Hipparchi* in Arati et Eudoxi phaenomena commentariorum libri iii, ad codicum fidem rec., germanica interpretatione et commentariis instr. Car. Manitius. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. lxxv, 376 pp. 4 Mk.
- Homer.* Diederich (B.) Quomodo dei in Homeri Odyssea cum hominibus commercium faciant. 8vo. Kiel, 1894. 87 pp.
- Ludwig (Arth.) De codicibus Batrachomyomachiae. 4to. Königsberg. 22 pp. 30 Pf.
- Mancini (A.) L'elemento lirico nell' epos omerico. 8vo. Pisa. 49 pp.
- Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie, herausgegeben von Prof. A. Fleckeisen. 21 Suppl. Bd. 1. Heft. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. 352 pp. 9 Mk.
- Jerome.* (St.) Sychowski (S. v.) Hieronymus als Litteraturhistoriker. Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung der Schrift des H. Hieronymus 'De viris illustribus.' I. 8vo. München, 1894. 44 pp.
- Keller* (H.) Studien zum Attischen Staatsrecht. 8vo. München, 1894. 145 pp.
- Kleinschmidt* (Dr. Max) Kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Sybaris. 4to. Hamburg, Herold. 26 pp. 2 M. 50.
- Köbert* (H.) Der zahme Oelbaum in der religiösen Vorstellung der Griechen. 8vo. München, 1894. viii, 48 pp.
- Kraut* (K.) und *W. Rösch.* Anthologie aus griechischen Prosaikern zum Uebersetzen ins Deutsche für obere Klassen. 1 Heft. 8vo. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. viii, 79 pp. 80 Pf.
- Lactantius.* Brandt (S.) De Lactantii apud Prudentium vestigiis. Festschrift. 4to. Heidelberg 1894. 10 pp.
- Livius.* Schmidt (Adf. M. A.) Zum Sprachgebrauch des Livius in den Büchern i, ii, xxi, xxii. Thl. I.: Elemente des livianischen Stiles. Stellung der Liviuslectüre. Formenlehre, Substantiv. 8vo. St. Pölten. 30 pp. 1 Mk.
- Lucretii Cari* (T.) De rerum natura libri vi., ed. A. Brieger. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. lxxiv, 206 pp. 1 M. 80.
- Lucretius.* Moreaux choisis de Lucrèce, avec une notice, des analyses, des résumés et des notes par C. Poyard. 16mo. Paris. viii, 184 pp. 1 fr. 50.
- Manuel Paléologue.* Lettres de l'Empereur Manuel Paléologue, publiées d'après trois manuscrits par E. Legrand. 1e fasc. 8vo. Paris. xii, 112 pp.
- Massolin* (Giac.) Il mito di Psiche: Carlo Bologna e Ludovico Savioli. 16mo. Venezia. 26 pp.
- Otto* (R.) Die sogenannte Sokratische Methode, dargestellt nach Xenophons Memorabilien und auf deren Anwendung im Gymnasialunterricht geprüft. 8vo. St. Paul. 27 pp. 1 Mk.
- Ovid's Metamorphosen* (in Auswahl), nebst einigen Abschnitten aus seinen elegischen Dichtungen, herausgegeben von Dr. M. Fickelscherer. Text. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. iv, 123 pp. 1 M.
- Paton* (J. M.) De cultu dioscurorum apud Graecos. I. 8vo. Bonn, 1894. 36 pp.
- Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung, unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Fachgenossen herausgegeben von Geo. Wissowa. 2 Halbband. 8vo. Stuttgart, Metzler. xv pp. and Col. 1441—2902. 15 M.
- Petit-Dutaillis* (C.) De Lacedaemoniorum reipublicae supremis temporibus. 8vo. Paris. 106 pp.
- Plato.* Christ (A. T.) Beiträge zur Kritik des Phaidon. 8vo. Prag, 1894. 23 pp.
- Πλουτάρχου τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς Εὐπροσφώνηται 'Ερμίστη Κορυθαί ἀγωντὶ τὴν ὀρθογονταετήριδα ὑπὸ Γρηγορίου Ν. Βερναδάκη. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. v, 36 pp. 1 M. 50.
- Ptolemy.* Boll (F.) Claudius Ptolemaeus als Philosoph. I. 8vo. München, 1894. 61 pp.

MESSRS. MACMILLAN & CO.'S NEW BOOKS.

LIFE IN ANCIENT EGYPT. Described by ADOLF ERMAN.

Translated by H. M. TIRARD. With 400 Illustrations and Eleven Plates. Super royal 8vo, 21s. net.
TIMES.—"A skilful translation of a well-known and esteemed German work, which treats of Egyptian antiquities in the light of modern discoveries, and thereby supplies a recognised English want."

THE HISTORY OF GREECE FROM ITS COMMENCEMENT TO THE CLOSE OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE GREEK NATION. By ADOLPH HOLM. Translated from the German. In Four Vols. Vol. I. To the End of the Sixth Century B.C. 8vo, 6s. net.

NATIONAL OBSERVER.—"It holds the attention fixed from first to last, and as we put it down our regret is that the Battle of Actium was so unconsciously premature in bringing the narrative to a close. Mr. Shuckburgh writes excellent lucid English, groups his facts clearly, and displays nothing of that objectionable habit of reading modern politics in ancient history."

TIMES.—"We cannot doubt that so careful a volume as this is destined for a long time to come to be the accepted general history of Rome in the higher forms of schools."

MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.—"It is pretty safe to predict that it will be extensively used. It supplies us with a full, accurate, vigorous, and on the whole carefully-balanced narrative of the history of Rome down to the point where Mr. Bury takes it up."

TIMES.—"The subject of conditional sentences has been made, in Mr. Horton-Smith's hands, to yield a good deal of amusement, combined with extensive learning and a vast amount of solid instruction."

MEISSNER'S LATIN PHRASE-BOOK. Translated from the Sixth German Edition by H. W. AUDEN, M.A., Assistant-Master at Fettes College, Edinburgh. Globe 8vo, 4s. 6d.

THE PHAEDO OF PLATO. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices, by R. D. ARCHER-HIND, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Second Edition. Printed in "Macmillan Greek." 8vo, 8s. 6d. net.

ATHENÆUM.—"Mr. Archer-Hind has brought out a second time his excellent edition of *The Phædo of Plato*, and Messrs. Macmillan have printed the text in their new Greek type, which is certainly extremely handsome."

TIMES.—"A second edition of Mr. Archer-Hind's very scholarly edition of *The Phædo of Plato*."

MACMILLAN'S SHORTER LATIN COURSE. Being an Abridgment of "Macmillan's Latin Course." Second Part. By A. M. COOK, M.A., and W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A., Assistant Masters at St. Paul's School. Globe 8vo, 2s.—KEY, 4s. 6d. net.

CLASSICAL SERIES.—NEW VOLUMES.

Fcap. 8vo.

THE ALCESTIS OF EURIPIDES. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE, D.Ph., Instructor in Greek at Barnard College, New York. 3s. 6d.

THUCYDIDES.—BOOK VII. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by E. C. MARCHANT, M.A., Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge. 3s. 6d.

GUARDIAN.—"Contains much fine scholarship and much that will benefit the advanced student."

SCHOOL GUARDIAN.—"The notes and appendices are alike excellent. We know of no better edition of this book for higher forms or passmen at the universities."

ACADEMY.—"The strong point of Mr. Marchant's edition is its excellent commentary, which leaves little to be desired in fulness or accuracy."

CICERO.—PRO MILONE. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by F. H. COLSON, M.A., Head Master of Plymouth College, late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. 2s. 6d.

LYCEUM.—"Deserves to become as popular as the other volumes of this admirable series."

LITERARY WORLD.—"A very careful and sound edition, with a most useful index to the notes."

PRO MURENA. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by J. H. FREESE, M.A., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. 2s. 6d.

SCHOOLMASTER.—"Mr. Freese's edition is a thoroughly good and practical one, containing a capital introduction, and about seventy-five pages of notes dealing thoroughly with the many difficulties which beset the student in working through a subject over which the mist of ages has thrown a deep (though not irremovable) shade of obscurity."

VIRGIL.—ÆNEID. Books I.—VI. Edited by T. E. PAGE, M.A. 6s.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PITT PRESS SERIES.

Annotated Editions of Greek Classics.

<i>Author.</i>	<i>Work.</i>	<i>Editor.</i>	<i>Price.</i>
Aristophanes	Aves—Plutus—Ranae	Green	3/6 each
"	Vespae	Graves	3/6
Euripides	Heracleidae	Beck	3/6
"	Hercules Furens	Gray & Hutchinson	2/-
"	Hippolytus	Hadley	2/-
"	Iphigeneia in Aulis	Headlam	2/6
"	Hecuba	Hadley	2/6
"	Orestes	Wedd	<i>In the Press</i>
Herodotus	Book V	Shuckburgh	3/-
"	" VI, VIII, IX	"	4/- each
"	" VIII 1—90, IX 1—89	"	2/6 each
Homer	Odyssey IX, X	Edwards	2/6 each
"	" XXI	"	2/-
"	Iliad VI, XXII, XXIII	"	2/- each
"	" XXIV.	"	<i>Nearly ready</i>
Lucian	Somnium, Charon, etc.	Heitland	3/6
"	Menippus and Timon	Mackie	3/6
Plato	Apologia Socratis	Adam	3/6
"	Crito	"	2/6
"	Euthyphro	"	2/6
"	Protagoras	J. & A. M. Adam	4/6
Plutarch	Demosthenes	Holden	4/6
"	Gracchi	"	6/-
"	Nicias	"	5/-
"	Sulla	"	6/-
"	Timoleon	"	6/-
Sophocles	Oedipus Tyrannus	Jebb	4/6
Thucydides	Book III	Spratt	<i>In the Press</i>
"	Book VII	Holden	5/-
Xenophon	Agesilaus	Hailstone	2/6
"	Anabasis Vol. I. Text.	Pretor	3/-
"	" Vol. II. Notes.	"	4/6
"	" I, II	"	4/-
"	" I, III, IV, V	"	2/- each
"	" II, VI, VII	"	2/6 each
"	Cyropaedeia I, II (2 vols.)	Holden	6/-
"	" III, IV, V	"	5/-
"	" VI, VII, VIII	"	5/-

London: C. J. CLAY & SONS, Cambridge University Press Warehouse,
Ave Maria Lane.